THE EMPIRE CLUB ADDRESSES

1948-49

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1948unse

THOS. H. HOWSE
President of the Empire Club of Canada for
1948-49

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE MEMBERS DURING THE YEAR 1948-49

Forty-sixth year of Issue

GOD SAVE THE KING

T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LTD.,
TORONTO, CANADA.

Copyright, Canada, 1949
The Empire Club of Canada

YEAR BOOK PUBLISHING COMMITTEE
1948-49

Sydney Hermant (Chairman)
Lieut.-Col. John Hyde Bennett, V.D.
John W. Griffin.

PRINTED AND BOUND IN CANADA
T. H. BEST PRINTING CO., LIMITED, TORONTO

"OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE"

YEAR 1948-49

Honorary President,
HIS EXCELLENCY, FIELD MARSHAL,
THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE VISCOUNT ALEXANDER OF TUNIS, G.C.B.,
GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF CANADA.

Officers:

President: THOMAS H. HOWSE
First Vice-President: T. A. PUGSLEY
Second Vice-President: GEORGE HARDY
Third Vice-President: SYDNEY HERMANT
Honorary Secretary: R. FORD RALPH
Secretary: JOHN HYDE BENNETT
Honorary-Treasurer and Treasurer: W. W. COMBER, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. JAMIESON, C.A.

Executive Committee:

COL. F. F. ARNOLDI, D.S.O.
W. L. ANDERSON
H. C. BOURLIER
J. A. COLE
H. G. COLEBROOK
BRIG. COLIN A. CAMPBELL, O.B.E., D.S.O.
S. S. FLETCHER
FRANK GEROW
JOHN W. GRIFFIN
WARREN B. HASTINGS
HORACE HARPHAM
G. A. LASCELLES
SQ. L. NORMAN A. NUNN
J. P. PRATT, K.C.
MAJOR A. O. THOMPSON, M.C.
COL. J. E. WILSON, M.C.

Immediate Past President:

TRACY E. LLOYD

Past Presidents:

ELLIS W. WILKINSON
WILLIAM BROOKS
COL. A. E. KIRKPATRICK, V.D.

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY

AND

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society of London, England, and The Empire Club of Canada at Toronto were both founded for a single purpose and with a common aim:—The strengthening of the bonds of unity within the Empire. This mutual objective is prosecuted with vigorous enthusiasm by the members of these organizations on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

CONTENTS

FRONTISPIECE - - - - - - - - - ii

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1948-49 - - v

AIMS AND AFFILIATIONS - - - - - - - - vi

ARTHUR GRAEME SLAGHT, K.C.
"The Threat to World Freedom" - - - - 1

SIR ERIC ROBERT DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, K.C.V.O., LL.D., D.LITT.
"The Effect of War on British Culture" - - - 16

MURRAY R. CHIPMAN, ESQUIRE, M.C., M.A.
"Europe Our Next Door Neighbour" - - - 29

SIR ARTHUR SHULDHAM REDFERN, K.C.V.O., C.M.G.
"Certain Aspects of British Life and Thought" - 52

DR. CECIL C. GOLDRING, M.A., D.PAED.
"Are the Schools Preparing Youth to Take Over?" - - - - - - - - - - 63

MAJOR GENERAL D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.
"Maple Leaf Up or Maple Leaf Down" - - - 76

WALTER N. DEISHER
"The Aircraft Industry in Canada and the Future Development of Jet Engines" - - - - - 81

SIR ALEXANDER CLUTTERBUCK, K.C.M.G., M.C.
"The Outlook Today" - - - - - - - 94

NORMAN COLLINS
"The Social Implication of Television" - - - 106

MAJOR FREDERICK J. NEY, M.C., LL.D., F.R.G.S.
"The Commonwealth on Trial" - - - - 117

Dr. B. K. Sandwell, B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.
"On Resting Merry in 1948" - - - - - - 130

James S. Duncan, C.M.G.
"Europe Still Holds the Key" - - - - - - 139

Donald Fleming, K.C., M.P.
"Where the Iron Curtain Falls" - - - - - 155

The Honourable Sardar Hardit Singh Malik, C.I.E., O.B.E., I.C.S.
"The New India" - - - - - - - - - - 173

Robert H. Saunders, C.B.E., K.C.
"Your Hydro Chairman Reports" - - - - 187

Hugh Llewellyn Keenleyside, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.H.S.
"Canadian Immigration Policy" - - - - - 198

John S. Coleman, LL.B.
"Reporting to the Public" - - - - - - - 213

Major Gladstone Murray, M.C., D.F.C., Croix de G.
"The Only Way to Save Civilization" - - - 224

M. L'Abbé Arthur Maheux, F.R.S.C.
"Was the King Right?" - - - - - - - 234

Margaret Aitken
"The Birth of a Nation" - - - - - - - 245

Merrill Denison, F.R.S.A.
"That Inferority Complex" - - - - - - 254

Dr. F. Cyril James, B.Com., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
"We Take Our Stand" - - - - - - - 268

Francis S. Harmon, LL.B.
"The Iron Curtain and the Silver Screen" - - 282

Percy James Philip
"Cross-Roads" - - - - - - - - - - 294

MAJOR VINCENT W. PRICE, K.C.
"The Battle for Europe's Mind" - - - - - 306

ARTHUR STRINGER
"Canada Finds Her Voice" - - - - - - 316

GORDON MCGREGOR
"International Aviation—An Empire Tie" - - 327

"ANNUAL MEETING" - - - - - - - - - 336

MAJOR-GENERAL C. CHURCHILL MANN, C.B.E., D.S.O.
"Conclusions as to the Future" - - - - - - 341

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT - - - - 355

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS - - - - - - - 358

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 1949-50 - - 360

CONSTITUTION - - - - - - - - - 361

MEMBERSHIP - - - - - - - - - 367

The opinions and views expressed in the Addresses, contained in this volume, are those of the speakers themselves and do not necessarily carry the full or partial endorsement of The Empire Club of Canada.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

"THE THREAT TO WORLD FREEDOM"

AN ADDRESS BY

ARTHUR GRAEME SLAGHT, K.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, October 7th, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen. Today The Empire Club of Canada opens its 46th season and possibly there never was a time during the life of this club when the immediate outlook confronting the British Empire, in times of so-called peace, was fraught with more grave problems and uncertainties.

May I remind you that the purpose of this club is first, to promote the welfare of Canada, and secondly, to support and strengthen the bonds of Empire of which Canada is steadily becoming such an important part.

One of the gravest problems facing Canada and the Empire at this moment is the insidious infiltration of Communism which is a threat to our very freedom.

Our guest speaker for today, Mr. Arthur Graeme Slaght, is bringing us a timely warning on various aspects of this menace.

Mr. Slaght is a lawyer and counsel of outstanding reputation throughout Canada. He has been in practice for over 40 years and his face is familiar in all our Courts, including the Supreme Court of Canada at Ottawa, and the Privy Council in London, England, where he has appeared on several occasions in important cases.

During the past war Mr. Slaght was Honourary Legal Advisor to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in Ontario on all internment matters and appeals. He also acted as Legal Advisor to the Canadian Government on the punishment of war criminals. All of which service was rendered as a donation to the National Interest.

From 1935 to 1945 Mr. Slaght represented the District of Parry Sound in the Federal Parliament, but the exacting nature of his Court work finally forced him to retire.

Mr. Slaght's Parliamentary career was perhaps a rather unusual one inasmuch as he represented a constituency 175 miles removed from Toronto, where he has always resided and practiced law. Whether or not he will tell us the reason for this, I do not know.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Arthur Graeme Slaght, K.C., whose subject will be "The Threat to World Freedom."

I propose to talk to you—about—

THE THREAT TO WORLD FREEDOM!

First, I want to be presumptuous enough to tell you a few things about Canada, our own country—things most of you already know, but which when marshalled and collected, are truly astounding—and when we realize how fortunate we are today, it should help us to wake up to the peril that threatens to take away the great heritage which freedom has bestowed upon us as Canadians.

Canada is unique amongst the nations of the world:

We are a member of the British Commonwealth whose Prime Ministers are gathering in London today for a very, very important conference.

We have for some years had a splendid, intimate cooperative arrangement with the United States for the Defence of North America, and our two nations have a Joint Committee constantly working on the job.

We have an Industrial Civilian Defence Committee under the able chairmanship of Mr. Harry Carmichael, who are planning in case of need to turn industrial plants into war-time production almost overnight.

Canadians are, in my view, the luckiest people in the world:

We are blessed to a singular degree, both as individual citizens of Canada and as a nation:

We should never fail to realize that the United States has invested in this country 2½ billion dollars—and American industry has established 2,000 branch plants here.

Gentlemen,—

Canada stands first in the world in the production of:
Nickel—newsprint—platinum—radium and uranium.
We stand second in:
Wood pulp and gold.
We stand third in:
Aluminum, copper, zinc and silver.
We stand fourth in:
'Wheat and lead.

And when I tell you we stand first in the production of uranium—do you know what that means?

Eldorado Mine in the Yellowknife Arctic area is producing 100 tons of pitchblend a day. Pitchblend is the matrix from which uranium is derived. At Eldorado, we have the highest production in the world.

Canada furnished the United States with the uranium which was used in the atomic bombs that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki overnight.

Canada is furnishing today to the United States the uranium with which she is making and improving in effectiveness the atomic bombs which will probably some day—(not too far distant)—save your lives and mine on this continent—and also the lives of the entire Anglo-Saxon world.

If I have by simple statement of facts persuaded you that we have a great heritage—let me turn to the other side of the picture:

We stand a chance *TO LOSE IT ALL!*

Canada and the Anglo-Saxon world of today are faced with the possible destruction of all freedom.

WHY?

We have just fought a great war to defeat a conspiracy of evil men to achieve world conquest; but we now face a still more formidable conspiracy by the gangster members of the Kremlin assisted by tens of thousands of traitors in our own country.

The Kremlin is the terroristic dictatorship of a small Communist Party over the masses of the people. Six million out of 180 million. All other parties have been suppressed in blood.

There is no opposition press.

Elections are rigged by the Communist Party on a selected ballot, without alternative candidates.

By Article 126 of the Constitution—every organization of every sort in the U.S.S.R. is to be controlled by its Communist nucleus.

The power of the Soviet Government is based on a huge police force that exterminates every vestige of opposition or complaint. It has authority to condemn men to long penal servitude without trial.

Let us pause here to look briefly at our Canadian foreign policy toward *world affairs* and the *United Nations.*

It was laid down at the last session of Parliament, and on April 29th our Minister of External Affairs made a clear, forceful statement of Canadian policy, and after scanning Hansard closely I find that:—

Mr. John Hackett, speaking for the Progressive-Conservatives—

Mr. M. J. Coldwell, speaking as Leader of the C.C.F.—

Mr. Solon Low, speaking as Leader of the Social Credit Party—practically and in effect approved of our Canadian policy.

If you will take the trouble to read Hansard of that date, you will find that Canada then delivered a message to the world—and that our policy is the most advanced, and in fact the only solution which, if adopted, will enable us to prevent war with Russia.

We are much more specific—much more fearless—and much more logical in our policy than the Governments of the United States or the United Kingdom have been in laying down their policy.

Political considerations in both those great countries have induced a timidity in my opinion, which we in Canada cannot be accused of.

You will find our foreign policy in six lines in Hansard. I quote:—

> "In the first place we shall not encourage or foster any activity which at this moment might provide any state with a legitimate—I emphasize the word 'legitimate'—excuse to withdraw from the United Nations. On the other hand, we shall not refrain from action which we know to be right merely because it displeases certain other members of the United Nations."

Translating this policy into the simplest language possible, it means that Canada stands for strengthening the United Nations from within to make it a real factor for peace by:—

(1) Carrying out the Barruch plan of turning atomic bombs over to the United Nations and outlawing any country that refuses to agree thereto—paying no heed whatever to any attempt to veto such a course.

(2) Setting up an international police force to carry out the policy of the United Nations, including inspection within every country. If Russia continues to refuse to cooperate,—treat her as an outlaw, and by organizing all the world but Russia within the United Nations, we will either—

(a) Avoid war altogether; or

(b) Wipe her off the map.

RUSSIA PLANS WORLD CONQUEST

That means YOU — that means ME —

YOUR CHILDREN — AND MINE!

And as Mr. Barruch once put it to the United Nations:

"WE CAN CHOOSE BETWEEN BEING THE QUICK OR THE DEAD!"

OUR SPY TRIALS and their exposure leave us in no doubt as to the perfidy of the Kremlin.

To our credit—we acted—and nine prisoners serving long terms in Kingston Penitentiary, is the answer.

Recent developments in the United States Senate Investigating Committee leave us in no doubt about what the Kremlin have been doing in that country.

We have seen Communism moving into the U.S. Department of State.

We have seen it moving into other Government Departments.

We have seen a Democratic President ask the Federal Bureau of Investigation to check the loyalty of the appointees of his predecessor in the Presidential office.

It was not a pleasant thing when the F.B.I. said:

> "You have over 200 Communists in the State Department, Mr. President, who got in under the authority of your predecessor in office."

In the most perilous period of national history, Communists in the State Department were telling the secrets of the U.S. Government to Moscow.

Why is it—I ask you again, why is it that in London and Washington, and until recently in Ottawa, we cannot realize the seriousness of the situation?

Baldwin, Chamberlain and the crew that tolerated Munich let the world in for five years of cruelty and bloodshed. Churchill warned them for two years it would come.

Up until the present Paris meeting—

Q. What has the British Socialist Government been doing to put teeth in the United Nations?

A. Turning the coal mines over to the Government and losing $300,000,000 in the first year of Socialist Government operation.

Up until the present Paris conference—

Q. What has the Washington Congress been doing to put teeth in the United Nations?

A. Devoting a lot of time to a learned debate on whether Negroes should have the right to vote or not.

The parallel to Nero fiddling while Rome was burning, has been the attitude in all three capitals—London—Washington and Ottawa—until ten days ago when the present Paris Conference opened.

The present Paris Conference, in my view, holds the brightest hope for peace that has appeared on the world horizon for the last three years—a lot of risk, too.

The United States—Britain—France—Canada and the Western Powers in Europe seemed to have waked up to the need for direct action, instead of senseless conferences, negotiations and fruitless talks with Stalin and his gang on which too much time has already been wasted.

The charge laid before the United Nations by the United States, Britain and France against the Communists on the Berlin issue—means business.

The resolution introduced by our General McNaughton for a unified dealing with the atomic bomb under the Barruch plan, is even more far-reaching and important.

These two items should expose Russia as never before —and should enlist on our side all the other nations of the world except Russia and her satellite stooges.

The risk is great—but it is worthwhile—and at long last I believe we are on the way to establish a permanent peace.

I believe our joint statesmen have found the long-sought political equivalent for war,—providing they courageously see it to a finish, and the nations other than Russia back them up in making the Barruch plan a reality.

You ask me what is the political equivalent for war?

It is the Barruch plan already approved by Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom, which is being presented by General McNaughton in the United Nations today—and involves setting up at once the equivalent of a World Government to deal only with atomic energy—and a world police force—and outlawing atomic war—with the right of inspection by the United Nations in any country in the world.

Yesterday's Paris despatch is most encouraging. I quote:

> "Several small countries pleaded today for continued big power efforts to work out a world plan to control the atomic bomb."

The present strategy, if it succeeds, will have all the other nations of the world in with us—if we have to fight Russia.

LET US SPEND A MOMENT ON WHAT HAS TAKEN PLACE IN PARIS IN THE LAST TEN DAYS:

In Paris today in the debates of the United Nations, stirring events are happening. The western nations have charged Russia with endangering the peace of the world by their cheeky, cruel attempt to starve two million Germans, and the British and United States occupation troops who are situate in Berlin.

Ten days ago in his opening speech, Vishinsky charged that a group of leaders in the Western Bloc are mapping an aggressive atomic war against Russia. He named Moscow, Kiev and other Russian cities as being the object of such attack under this plan.

Vishinsky also charged Canada with participating in naval manoeuvres held in the North Atlantic in September under the supervision of the Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Chevrier, for our delegation, did not deny this.

Mr. Hector McNeill, a delegate and British Minister of State, likened Vishinsky's address to "auld cauld kale"—which those of you who speak the Gaelic language will know, and which Mr. McNeill explained at the time—meant "warmed over hash!"

I am afraid that I would not make a good diplomatic representative, because I would have been inclined to tell Mr. Vishinsky that his statement was absolutely false insofar as it charged the Western Bloc with mapping a war of aggression.

And to tell him furthermore, if the Western Bloc had planned such an attack—in the event of Russia starting a war—he had named only part of the Russian cities that he could expect to be promptly destroyed by atomic bombs, and that he could expand his list to other Russian cities and strategic establishments for the manufacture of munitions of war!

One would like to have also told him that the Russian people would, in the event of his gang starting a war—be able to place the blame for the destruction of the inhabitants of those cities, squarely on Vishinsky as a reckless and cold-blooded murderer.

A few days ago I read an interview which the Lion Tamer at the Maple Leaf Gardens Circus, gave to the press. He said that his control over the beasts was entirely bluff, and that he had to keep them from finding out it was bluff—or he would be destroyed. ✓

Vishinsky—I think on the same day that this appeared—in effect warned the Paris delegates that Russia had the atomic bomb. No one believed him.

And on behalf of the British Lion—Ernest Bevin pulled no punches!

Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin of Great Britain answered Vishinsky in unmistakable language, and told the United Nations Assembly in impassioned tones that only Russia will be to blame if the black fury of atomic warfare descends on mankind. I quote his exact language:—

> "With all the solemnity at my disposal," Bevin said, "if the black fury, the incalculable disaster of atomic war should fall upon us, one power by refusing its cooperation in the control and development of these great new forces for the good of humanity, will alone be responsible for the evils which may be visited upon humanity."
>
> Looking squarely at Vishinsky, he went on to say:—
>
> "Let there be light. Let there be knowledge; let the common people have freedom of movement, fredom of information and contact.
>
> "Let them learn that among the ordinary people in other countries . . . there are no such things as aggressors.
>
> "It is not the simple people who want to fight. It is not they who want to take other peoples' homes and territories . . ."

So Vishinsky, the Lion Tamer, did not fool the lions!

Bevin's speech received one of the greatest ovations ever heard in an Assembly session. Only delegates from the Soviet Bloc were silent.

It may be significant that the same day Bevin spoke, the Defence Ministers of Britain, Belgium, France, Luxemburg and the Netherlands—with Canadian and United States observers sitting in—met twice in Paris and made public the statement that they discussed plans for coordinating a programme of developing their military resources.

Following these exchanges, and on Sunday last—just four days ago—the Russian authorities in Berlin handed a letter to the British and American Deputies threatening the western powers with "serious consequences" for repeated alleged violations of air traffic rules over Berlin, and the letter concluded with a demand that the violations end.

The following day, on Monday last, just three days ago—the Soviet Government proposed that the Four Power Foreign Ministers Council be called to consider both the Berlin impasse and the entire German situation. They set out a number of reasons for their conduct, both on the Berlin situation and the atomic bomb situation, which contained the usual misstatements of fact and obvious false excuses.

Russia blamed the United States, Great Britain and France for the entire Berlin trouble.

This is another obvious attempt to stall, and to prevent condemnation from the United Nations Assembly which the western powers are seeking on both points, which was promptly turned down 9-2—so Vishinsky and his pals are running out and won't debate it.

They had already been told by the western powers in a joint allied note that the Communists had shamelessly welshed on the four power agreement made at Moscow that the blockade of Berlin would be lifted and the Soviet "Eastern Mark" would be the sole money in Berlin under four power control.

Stalin pledged that all restrictions would be lifted and on the basis of this agreement, solemnly entered into by him at Moscow, a directive was sent to the four military governors of Germany who were to work out details.

Sokolovsky did not conform to this directive. He insisted on restrictions on air traffic.

The three western powers immediately told Moscow its Berlin commander was not observing the Moscow accord, whereupon Moscow backed up its Berlin commander and in turn the western powers made it clear that unless Russia was ready to lift the blockade as she had agreed to do, it would be futile to continue negotiations, and at the same time told Moscow that the attitude of the Soviet commander in Berlin and the encouragement given to attempts to overthrow the Berlin City Government, proves that the Russian Government refuses to execute its agreement and wants to destroy the rights of the western powers in Berlin.

Britain is feverishly conducting a recruiting campaign. Public men of all parties are making fervent speeches.

John Foster Dulles has flown back to America and is in conference with Dewey.

General Marshall has been called back to Washington for conference with Truman.

Day before yesterday, Russian copies of the American superfortress B.29 were reported having arrived in Germany for the first time.

A high Allied air officer reported yesterday that the Russians have about 4,500 planes in the Eastern Zone of Germany of which 1,600 are front-line combat planes.

And that the figure of 4,500 is believed to be about 10 times the available American aircraft in Germany.

Gentlemen, if that does not indicate that the world today is sitting on a powder-keg with the fuse laid—then I find myself unable to analyze diplomatic negotiations!

My personal hope is that the western allies including Canada with all the other smaller nations, will stand firm and secure in unequivocal condemnation of Russia in her blockade of Berlin—and what is even more important, will secure the entire membership of the United Nations other than Russia and her satellites, to support the United States proposal (known as the Barruch plan) to turn over the atomic bomb in all its phases to an international control commission of the United Nations (exclusive of Russia)—and will outlaw any nation who attempts to manufacture the atomic bomb—and will create a military police force (again exclusive of Russia) with sufficient power to enforce outlawry of the bomb and its manufacture.

The Russian people undoubtedly do not want war. You and I cannot predict what the Stalin-Molotov-Vishinsky gang of 14 in charge of the Kremlin and the destiny of Russia, may do to blunder us into war—but one thing seems crystal clear to me—and that is—

"TO AVERT WAR WE MUST RUN THE RISK OF WAR."

We must not recede one inch from a united compact of the nations of the world (exclusive of Russia and her satellites).

She came into the United Nations to make sure it wouldn't work. She has succeeded in preventing it from working to the fullest possible extent. She will probably try and remain in, even though criticized—but if the balance of the nations enter into a pact to turn the atomic bomb over to a commission which they will create, and outlaw any nation and provide for inspecting the industries of that nation—then Russia will have to fish or cut bait.

We are far better off with her outside than inside, because she is a veritable snake within the bosom of the United Nations Organization.

In addition to menacing world conditions at Paris, we have a terrific Fifth Column menace in Canada and the United States and in Britain. Six days ago, on October 1st, in a by-election in a division of the City of Glasgow where a Government Labour candidate was elected—she received 13,706 votes. The Conservative, 7,181—and Patrick Kerrigan, the Communist, 4,233.

That is in one division of the great naval city of Glasgow on the Clyde where warships are built.

In the by-election in Montreal following the conviction and imprisonment in Kingston penitentiary of Fred Rose, the Communist member of the House of Commons, there were five candidates. The Communist candidate polled 6,000 votes.

In this City of Toronto some ten years ago, Tim Buck ran for Mayor as an avowed Communist, and polled 30,000 votes.

There are two Communist members in the British House of Commons. There are two Communist members in the Legislature of the Province of Ontario seated in the heart of Toronto.

The seriousness of the Communist Fifth Column meetings in England was emphasized on Monday last when Defence Minister A. V. Alexander in his recruiting campaign, addressing a meeting on the steps of the Mansion House in London, was showered with anti-war pamphlets and Communist posters—and booed.

The same day at a recruiting rally in suburban Croyden, a Communist leader and a gang of young Communists, interrupted Air Marshal Lord Tedder in a recruiting speech, and husky recruiting sergeants had to physically carry and throw them out of the meeting. Communist attempts to interfere with both Anthony Eden and Winston Churchill at recruiting meetings were reported yesterday.

A banner "NO WAR FOR YANKEE DOLLARS" and posters with slogans calling for disarmament were displayed with a slogan—"FIGHT FOR PEACE, NOT WALL STREET."

Twenty were arrested and some of the pamphlets bore the impression of the London District Communist Party.

I know something of Fifth Column activities in Canada in the early years of the recent war. I say to you solemnly that I believe the Communist Fifth Column in all three countries, is ten times as menacing and efficient as were the German and Italian Fifth Columns in the recent war.

I am not a war monger—but I do view the situation with alarm unless our western countries show the intestinal fortitude to make clear to Russia—

1. WE CAN WHIP HER IF SHE STARTS A WAR.
2. WE MEAN BUSINESS AND WILL TAKE NO MORE AGGRESSION FROM HER.
3. WE WILL MAKE RUBBLE HEAPS OF RUSSIAN CITIES AND RUSSIAN CENTRES OF PRODUCTION AT THE VERY OUTSET, IF THE KREMLIN ARE STUPID ENOUGH AND BRAZEN ENOUGH TO BLUNDER US INTO WAR.

I am sorry my address has not been more reassuring.

If you charge me with being an alarmist—I plead guilty at once—because I do not regard it as good citizenship to sit mute or stand idly by at a time of grave peril to our country.

There comes a time when the ostrich trick of putting our heads in the sand is sheer folly.

What more should we do—you ask me?

In my view—and it is purely a personal view—

1. We should immediately call an emergency session of Parliament.
2. We should immediately appoint a non-party, non-partisan advisory Defence Committee of Parliament to function during the sitting of Parliament and afterwards, should war break—to advise on matters involving the Defense of Canada.
3. Parliament should triple the appropriations granted at the last session for Air Force Defense. Don't forget we have a surplus from last year of Seven Hundred Million Dollars.

There is no implied political criticism in those recommendations. Parliament (not the Government) fixed the money grant for Air Defense and all political parties participated therein—so that no stones can be thrown at any one party.

DOES ANYONE QUESTION THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF OUR AIR FORCE?

DOES ANYONE DOUBT THAT SUPREMACY IN THE AIR WILL BE THE GREATEST FACTOR

IN WINNING THE NEXT WAR—IF WAR SHOULD COME?

Let us hope and pray that our diplomats and representatives on the United Nations may bring us through to peace.

Let us also remember that there is always hope that men who desire to do the right, will prevail—and that

"THERE IS ALWAYS A FAR HORIZON FOR ONWARD LOOKING MEN."

"THE EFFECT OF WAR ON BRITISH CULTURE"

An Address By

SIR ERIC ROBERT DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN,
K.C.V.O., LL.D., D.LITT.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, October 14th, 1948

My Lord, Honoured Guests and Gentlemen: I wonder if we in this fair Canada of ours realize how fortunate we were during the last war. Owing to our geographical position we were able to wage war in far places with all our energies while our home land remained inviolate from land, sea or air.

As we all know, England was not so fortunately situated and air bombing destroyed countless art treasures and historical monuments, which can never be replaced.

Today we are very fortunate indeed in having as our guest speaker, a very distinguished visitor from Great Britain, in the person of Sir Eric Robert D. Maclagan, who is going to tell us some of the effects the war has had on British culture.

Sir Eric is a graduate of Christ Church, Oxford and when I remind you that his father rose to great heights and became Archbishop of York, it would seem but natural that Sir Eric would choose a career in the realm of art and literature.

Sir Eric joined the staff of the Victoria and Albert Museum in 1905 and served in various capacities until he became a Director and Secretary, resigning in 1945.

He was loaned to the Foreign Office in 1916, went to France in 1918 and was attached to the Press Section of the British Peace Delegation to Paris in 1919.

Sir Eric has lectured at Dublin, Edinburgh, Belfast and Harvard Universities, and also at University College, Hull.

Sir Eric is President of the Museum Association and Vice-President of the Society of Antiquaries. He is also Chairman of the Ministry of Town Planning and several other public bodies.

With such a background it would seem to be but natural that Sir Eric is also well-known as a writer and has written several books and articles.

I now have much pleasure in introducing Sir Eric Robert D, Maclagan, K.C.V.O., whose subject will be "The Effect of War on British Culture."

Gentlemen: I think it is extremely rash of you to have invited as a speaker one whose life has almost, if I might say so, been spent in a glass case in a museum, who would really qualify for the description which these dealers are so fond of giving to the object you wish to buy when they say it is a real museum piece.

But, as your Chairman has reminded you, the war and the continued bombing from the air did have effects of very wide reaching character in England and they even touched those sequestered places—museums. Everybody, I think one may say, in most parts of England—quite certainly everybody in London—had a good deal to put up with and those who came to London from outside were generous in their praise of the way in which especially the poorer people who necessarily suffered very much more, the magnificent way in which they stood up to it, but it was a real crisis for all forms of life, including those which could be summed up in the word "*Culture*".

There is a story which I am afraid may be familiar to those, who like myself, come over from England, about one old woman who was living in a small house and the house was bombed and reduced to ruins and she was buried under the ruins and the rescue squad came along and uncovered her head, and found she was all right, comparatively, but it would take them some time to dig her out. So they cheered her up the best they could and after a few minutes one of them who had been exploring the ruins of the house came back and said, "It's all right, Ma, we have found a bottle of whisky in a broken cupboard. I will uncork it and pass some of it down to you", whereupon a voice came out of the ruins, "Don't you dare touch that bottle, young man. I am keeping that for an emergency."

That was, I think I may say, fairly safely, the spirit in which a great many people in London met those attacks and they always felt that the real emergency might come afterward.

But what I have been particularly asked to speak to you about is the effect of the war and the immediate aftermath of the war on the people who have contributed to Art and Letters in various forms. I think one would have to make some kind of division between the different kinds of creative artists, because I think the effects of the war were very different upon them.

If I might speak first of all of writers, I suppose in a way they suffered less from the impact of war than most other classes of creative artists. That is to say that their material is so simple that they continued to be available. The war provided them with an additional subject of absorbing interest . I should be afraid to say how many novels written during the latter part of the war depended on their *dénouement* on the happy accident of a bomb wiping out more inconvenient members of the cast, and the demand for books was enormous. Of course, it was difficult to get books printed in sufficient numbers, but nonetheless a great many books were written and all of them were bought with avidity, so it was extremely difficult, as a rule, to secure copies of books unless you got in right at the beginning.

Just before the war England lost the writer who was acclaimed to have been the greatest poet in the English language—W. B. Yeats, who died in 1939. During the war his younger contemporary friend, T. S. Eliot, went on writing great poetry and has just been, more or less on the occasion of his 60th birthday, rewarded with the highest honour which the King can confer upon him—the Order of Merit—and without attempting to go into a general catalogue of writers, such authors as Somerset Maugham produced admirable work during the war and a great many others that, as I said before, it would be invidious and tedious to attempt to mention.

Now, if I passed from writers to people with whom I was very directly concerned at the Victoria and Albert Museum, the craftsmen to whose reputation England really owes a great deal, they suffered terribly from the impact of war because materials of almost all kinds were in short supply and silversmiths and potters and cabinet makers and so forth literally could not carry on their work because they could not get raw materials. Furthermore, they were just the kind of producers whose work would be less in demand and it was only with the utmost difficulty that they managed somehow to carry on through the years of the war. A certain amount of assistance was given them. An institution was founded with which I had the honour of being connected, the Central Institute of Arts and Design, and that tried to keep the interest in the crafts alive and made certain effort, not altogether without success, to get materials for them. But there is no doubt that they were extremely hard hit and I am afraid that that particular side of English art production has suffered in consequence. And to a slightly less extent the same applies to sculptors and to painters. They also found the question of material extremely difficult. It was almost impossible to get canvasses, it was very difficult to get actual paints and the other materials of their craft, and had it not been for a great deal of help from the Government I think they would have emerged in even worse shape than they actually did. But the Government employed a great number of the younger artists on war work, some of them going abroad with our armies, some of them staying at home and recording the changed life of Great Britain during those war years.

They again, like the writers, were provided with a fresh group of subjects and many of them—let me mention just two examples: the painter who died only recently, Nash—one of our best painters who did a great deal of admirable work in the way of war pictures, especially connected with the Air Force; and Graham Sutherland, who did wonderful pictures of the work in factories in England, and perhaps above all, the sculptor, Henry Moore, whose drawings of the life in the shelters and of life in some industries like the mining industry, are probably familiar to some of you, at any rate in reproductions.

They, then, as I say, carried on as best they could and curiously enough, actually during the war two of those artists—the two I mentioned—Graham Sutherland and Harry Moore—were given two important commissions for a church in the Midlands at Northampton and they produced two of the finest works of religious art which have been executed I think in this century.

The musicians were very active, I think, during the war. It is a long time since England has had a musician of international reputation and I think that there is one now in Britain whose opera, "Peter Grimes" was actually produced, if I remember right, just before the end of the war, and has since another opera of great interest and many other works, and other composers—again I don't propose to inflict a catalogue on you—went on with their work—again not much affected by any difficulties with material, although naturally conditions were difficult for all creative artists.

There was an immense activity in theatre during the war. That, I suppose, is natural enough. People urgently require recreation and all forms of theatrical life received a great impetus during the war. There was only one theatre in England which was open absolutely continuously, and I am bound to admit to you that it was of the kind that is known on this side of the Atlantic, certainly in the United States and perhaps also in Canada, as burlesque, but it still has a "pride" notice: "We Kept Open All The Time", outside of the theatre. Although most theatres had to close down at intervals, sometimes owing to destruction, sometimes owing to extraordinary difficulties of transport and lighting and although they had to change their hours, I believe anyone would agree the theatre was in a very flourishing condition during the war in London and in other parts of England and that it is in a very flourishing condition in England now. I can certainly assure you that anyone who wants to get a seat for any of the better performances in London has to book a long time ahead.

The architects during the war did very little work. They were, most of them, doing other things, but immediately after the war came to an end they were in a period when the difficulty was for them to choose between all the different commissions for reconstruction which they were being given.

That is a very hasty kind of summary about the effect, so far as I see it, of the war itself on creative artists. But I think what is more interesting is the effect of the war on the public of those artists.

You can imagine during the war it was not easy in London for people to satisfy their natural desires to see pictures, sculpture, so forth, or even to hear music, although music was available in various forms in London, even through the war. But there is no doubt whatever that the moment the war was over the English public and, of course, the London public is the most fortunate in that respect—the English public showed an almost incredible and very astonishing avidity for every kind of art. Every exhibition that has been held since the war has been crowded out, and in most cases you will see what is to us a very unusual sight—queues standing outside museums and art galleries to get into exhibitions.

They laugh at us a little bit in London about the way we queue for everything. They tell us the immediate instinct of the English man, and perhaps still more of the English woman, is when she sees a queue to join it and find out later what people are lining up for.

But those queues for all the exhibitions that have been held in London since the war have been very impressive sights, and for various reasons: since the war there has been a far greater movement of works of art, both from foreign countries and from other parts of the British Empire than there was before the war, and these temporary exhibitions have excited an enormous amount of interest in England.

Further, there is now as a direct result of the war, a body called the Arts Council, which is sending works of art from London to the provinces in England in far larger quantity than was ever possible before the war, and these exhibitions, again in the provinces, are exciting an enormous amount of interest.

That is a point on which I should fear no kind of contradiction, that one immediate result of the war has been to arouse and excite the appetite of the public in Great Britain for works of art.

I think exactly the same thing is true about music. I have already said that the theatres in London are crowded and I hope will remain crowded because that is the best guarantee of good productions. But certainly concerts in London are absolutely packed now. We received a terrible loss in the fairly early stage in the war because the only really convenient concert room in England, the Queen's Hall, was completely destroyed by a direct hit from a bomb. But the concerts had to be moved to the Albert Hall, which while much larger is a very much less convenient building for most kinds of concerts and they are absolutely crowded out there.

In museums during the war naturally there was not much to be seen. All the most important things were sent from the London Museums and Galleries to places of safety in the country and I hardly dare even mention that subject because my recollections of it are so very full and so many queer and interesting things happened in connection with that evacuation that I should be talking for the rest of the afternoon if I began mentioning it.

But some of the museums—the Victoria and Albert Museum, with which I, myself, have the honour of being connected, kept open, like the little burlesque theatre, practically all through the war. We were closed for about a month or two after the outbreak of war when no one had the least idea what was going to happen. We were closed for a fortnight when we had an explosive bomb 125 feet in front of our front entrance which left us by no means unscathed and you couldn't admit people to museums or libraries when a large piece of ceiling had a habit of coming down with the vibration from outside.

But apart from a few breaks like that the Victoria and Albert Museum was open right through the war. In the latter part of the war they started an extremely good system by which one picture a month was brought back from its place of safety in Wales and put on exhibition and I can assure you, if you have only one great old first rate Master to look at, you look at it with a great deal of attention. It used to be carried down to the safest place in the cellar during the night. However dark the days, it was visible.

The Director of the National Gallery, Sir Kenneth Clark, realized they could not show their pictures. There were a certain number of rooms in the National Gallery which were reasonably weather-proof, with wide ceilings and floors, and he had the very happy idea that these could be used for concerts. So quite early in the war a system of very brief lunch hour concerts was started at the National Gallery at which the very best performers in England gave their services for a very low fee and which were arranged so the people could come in in their lunch hour, and I can assure you, practically every day those concerts at the National Gallery were crowded out.. There again, if you wanted to hear a quartette, or hear Myra Hess playing Beethoven on the piano, or something of that kind you had to go pretty early if you were going to get in. Arrangements were made by which a simple little sandwich lunch could be obtained and some people who gave up their lunch hour listening to good music didn't go altogether unfed.

That was one of the happiest after effects of the war on the art life of Great Britain, and I think it is a thing that probably will have later results because though the National Gallery is, of course, now occupied with its own pictures, there is such a demand for the lunch hour concert that I very much hope they will be able to start up somewhere else before very long.

Now, I can't pass over altogether, and here again if I were to begin talking about it I should go on indefinitely, the most tragic effect of the war on the art in England which was, of course, the actual destruction of great historical architectural monuments and particularly of the 17th and 18th century churches in the City of London. That is a loss which can never be altogether made good, but there is great activity about repairing those churches that are capable of repair.

I, myself, have had the honour of being associated with those activities during and after the war, and everything is being done that can be done, but I am afraid it is going very slowly because of the lack of labour and the lack of material. It is going very much more slowly than we had hoped.

Now, I have already touched on some of the post-war effects, but I think one might add this to what I have said: That is I have already said the public has shown this extreme avidity for exhibitions, for music, for all kinds of art. It is showing the same enthusiasm still for books. But there the position remains a difficult one. We are very, very short of paper in England. All publishers are suffering from it and they are quite unable to make good the losses to their stocks because we have to remember that many of the publishers have places of business in the city and that those places of business were destroyed and years of books, years of stock were destroyed in one moment by bombs. The publishers are in great difficulty and I believe I can say that this applies particularly to educational books.

One of your guests at the head table today knows far more about that than I do, but I do not think I should be incurring any risk of contradiction if I said that is one of the great problems in England now—the great dearth of educational books, the great difficulty of buying books, of even the most essential kind. This has driven people to make much larger use of the public and university libraries than they did before the war.

At the same time in our universities, particularly, there is a very great increase in the number of students. In some of the small universities, particularly in the country the numbers have been doubled and trebled in relation to what they were before the war, whereas it has been impossible to make a corresponding increase in the teaching staff. So all work in universities in England is being done under very considerable difficulty, with the shortage of books and the shortage of accommodation and perhaps most serious, the shortage of teachers.

That is an effect about which we are all naturally delighted, that more people should want to go to university, but we haven't altogether solved the problem of how to meet their requirements when they get there.

There are two developments in England which I think must have just a brief mention. One, the creation last year of the Edinburgh Festival. That was a great experiment. I had put up a very considerable sum of money to guarantee the Festival and they arranged a programme of exhibitions, of concerts, of plays, of operas, of everything, every sort of activity during the period of three weeks or so in the summer. The Festival last year was an immense success—not quite a success financially, but a success in every other way and it was repeated this year. It was again a tremendous success and I believe there is no question that it is going to be repeated next year.

It was quite a new departure in England. To some extent I suppose an imitation of the Festivals of the same kind that had been held on the Continent at Salzburg and other places in the period between the wars and has been becoming a permanent characteristic of cultivated life in Scotland.

Then we had an extremely interesting open air exhibition of sculpture in Batterson Park. Such a thing, as far as I know, had never been held before. Statues and groups were taken out of the national collections, out of the galleries and other collections and put in the open air and a great many sculptors provided work of their own and lent it and two or three sculptors, including Henry Moore, did work especially for the exhibition. It was a quite unexampled success. I was a little bit concerned with it. I was on the Committee and we had some doubts, partly based on our knowledge of the uncertainties of the English climate, as to whether an outdoor exhibition in London would really be a great success. It was a triumphant success. We had far, far more visitors than we expected. In fact, the visitors were so numerous that the grass was completely trodden away in front of the more prominent exhibits. I hope very much that that experiment may be repeated at some future date.

May I then sum up by saying that in spite of all the difficulties which artists and writers and persons with the power of creation in all different fields met with during the war, and in spite of many difficulties that exist now that the war is over, on the whole the record is rather a cheering one, so far as England is concerned. I don't think the future ages will look back—it is very nearly ten years now—on the last nine or ten years as being in any way a barren or discreditable period in English art and letters. At any rate, I think we may say fairly that England has emerged with at least three workers in the field of the Arts who have that kind of international reputation which is not very common at any time and to which only very few nationals of any country can aspire. I mean, of course, T. S. Eliot, as a poet. It is an extraordinary thing to look in the volume which has just been published of essays and so forth, just published in honour of Eliot's 60th birthday. The immense amount of interest his poetry has aroused, for example, in India and Ceylon and in practically all the countries of Europe. Nearly all the greater European countries have published translations of Eliot's works and essays, and we have I believe, given the world a poet of the very first order.

Then in sculpture, I think exactly the same applies to

Henry Moore. I am myself concerned with the art work of the British Council and I know from every Council the one unfailing demand, is, can't you send us a large scale exhibition of the work of Henry Moore? Probably many of you know there was a very big exhibition last year in New York and a large part of it went on afterward to Australia. But sculpture is difficult to transport. It is risky to transport and it is expensive to transport and that does make it much more difficult for the British Council or any other body to send around exhibitions of sculpture and the corresponding exhibitions of painting and drawing and so forth.

Even so, I think there is no question that perhaps for the first time during anything like the last couple of centuries, England has now a sculptor who, whether people like him or not—I don't mean to say everybody does admire Henry Moore—certainly has a reputation of the most far-reaching character.

And the third I would name would certainly be the musician, Benjamin Britten, because there again, except for the light opera, Gilbert and Sullivan, English opera has not had much of a public outside England for a long time. Benjamin Britten's "Peter Grimes", and his second opera, "The Rape of Lucrece" have been performed in Switzerland, in Belgium, in Stockholm, and in Paris if I remember right, and in other countries of Europe, and it is only the very great difficulty of moving materials of opera about that have prevented those operas being given in a great many other countries as well.

I think even with those three artists as types to mention for what England has managed to achieve of recent years, that England need not be altogether ashamed of herself in this rather remote, if you like, aspect, which you have so very kindly allowed me to speak to you about today.

And I would only like before I sit down to apologize for the fact that my sequestered life has made it quite impossible for me to address you on any of those many subjects of importance and interest which I know your other guests have treated in the recent past. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: I am going to ask Mr. Pugsley if he will be good enough to voice the thanks of this meeting to Sir Eric.

MR. PUGSLEY: Mr. President and Gentlemen: I would like to express the thanks of the Club for the entertaining and instructive address that we have heard today. As Sir Eric is doubtless aware we have recently had an inspiring exhibition of the work of the British War Artists here in Toronto. In Canada we have also been deeply affected by British culture and we have enjoyed hearing what is happening in Britain today. We are therefore deeply grateful to Sir Eric for the time and trouble he has taken in giving us this talk today. I have much pleasure in moving a vote of thanks.

(Applause.)

"EUROPE OUR NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOUR"

An Address By

MURRAY R. CHIPMAN, ESQUIRE, M.C., M.A.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, October 21st, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen: During the past decade it can very truly be said that the aeroplane has annihilated space, with the result that even continents, which are separated by vast oceans, are now only a few hours of air travel apart and are virtually next-door neighbours.

Today our guest speaker, Murray R. Chipman, Montreal Manager of the Company we both represent, has chosen as his subject "Europe, Our Next-Door Neighbour."

Mr. Chipman has travelled extensively in Europe and is a keen observer. In 1937 he visited England, Germany, Scandinavia, Russia and the former Balkan States and he recently returned after spending two months visiting England, Germany, Italy and Czechoslovakia.

Born in Kentville, Nova Scotia, he is a graduate of Acadia University.

Mr. Chipman served overseas in the first World War with the 85th Nova Scotia Highlanders and was awarded the Military Cross.

He is well and favourably known in Montreal for his enthusiastic work in the interests of the Montreal Community Chest, Canadian Red Cross and many other charitable organizations, and is a strong advocate of a better understanding between English and French-speaking Canadians to the end that they may work harmoniously towards their common destiny.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr.

Murray R. Chipman, M.C., whose subject will be "Europe, Our Next-Door Neighbour."

"EUROPE—OUR NEXT DOOR NEIGHBOUR"

The subject "Europe—Our Next Door Neighbour" was chosen to emphasize two facts — the closeness of Europe in this age of flight and the immense significance to us here of European viewpoints and economic recovery. For what happens there will touch our lives directly.

The age of flight is now taken for granted but I am not sure we realize fully its implications. In some ways it takes the glamour out of going to far places. Leaving Toronto in the afternoon and arriving in London the next morning makes you feel you have just commuted to Europe.

But commuters are neighbours. We have an interest in our neighbours and they in us. Especially is this true of the Western European countries, which are the cradle of our mutual civilization.

It was fascinating to find that England had all its old magic. We took a motor trip in Southern England and that lovely land charmed us, that compact stage on which so much of history has been played.

London—drab, austere, licking its honourable wounds, recaptured one's heart. Especially as I sat in the Mother of Parliaments and heard Premier Atlee say that whatever might be the benefits of the Union of Western Europe such a plan must not prejudice the strength and unity of the British Commonwealth.

Opposite him Churchill sat, slumped on the front bench, feet on the table, his head and jowls thrust forward from his body like a defiant turtle. Later, as I was leaving the House, Big Ben boomed and one recalled other days. . . . "This is the BBC news. Our troops are being evacuated from Dunkirk." Remember?

A tough and resilient breed are these British, but they are having their problems. Everywhere we went one got the impression that Britain is living on borrowed time. The shortage of dollars, diminishing gold reserves, high prices resultant from the cost of raw materials and the crisis in production are the negative factors. True there has been a remarkable recovery of industry in some fields, notably steel and shipbuilding, and England is in the vanguard in many fields of research. Her exports are showing creditable gains at the expense of local needs.

Recent reports would indicate that the increase in exports will possibly clear up the deficits in trading account by 1951—counting on Marshall Aid to fill in the gap in the meantime and also to ease the depletion of U.K. dollar and gold reserves. Britain's dollar deficit position is of such magnitude in relation to this continent that we must be realistic and expect that she will buy elsewhere, unless we purchase more from Britain or finance our export programme. Britain herself is granting $282 million in sterling to Marshall Aid countries in effect to finance their purchase of British goods.

Britain's prices are high. The crisis in production is an important factor. This stems in part from the policies of the Labour Government. They are telling the workers on the one hand "your future is secure"; and on the other, they are urging them to produce more and more. To date the worker's feeling of security has largely outdistanced his sense of urgency to produce. Socialism does make men content to lean and not to compete. But Britain must sell in a competitive world market.

The rigidity of management, trade association and trade union policies and the traditionalism of the workers are other factors.

Here is a case instance. I spoke to a textile manager. He said their production was 65% of pre-World War II to which should be added another 6½% to make allowance for the shorter work week. Why this only 71½% production level?

He gave these reasons. First—management. There was over-management. The business was carrying more managerial talent than it needed—too much management remote from the actual production job. Moreover, he felt that they of management had evaded the issue of being frank and realistic with their workers possibly in part because there was a Labour Government in power even although this government was urging production, too.

Also he was candid in saying that dividends were coming in too easily now after many pre-war years of no dividends.

Then there was the factor of frustration. It had taken them fourteen months to get into production with a new product after interminable delays in seeing government officials, getting bureaucratic decisions, filling out forms, getting raw material and rental permits—waiting, waiting to achieve what could well have been done in one month.

And there were the workers themselves. The management had tried time and motion studies to improve production per man but with the worker stoutly holding on to his traditional methods. Incentive pay did not seem to do the trick either. Work habits were stronger than the desire for gain.

Nor was food the factor one might have anticipated. For instance, they had taken on three displaced persons. After some preliminary special diet to restore their below-par health they were on the same diet as everyone else and were out-producing the others considerably.

Inherent in the Economic Recovery Program of Marshall Aid is the self-help of the recipient countries. Mr. Paul Hoffman is on the right track in urging that British industry look at its methods vis-a-vis North American standards. It may be unpalatable but it is the course of wisdom for Britain not solely because Marshall Aid expects it, but because facing up to its too slow work pace and low production per man hour is Britain's basic road to recovery.

The recent study of the National Institute of Economic Research revealed that 1935-1939 average productivity in manufacturing industry in Britain was only half of that of the United States. Between 1935-1947 the United Kingdom index of total production rose 9% while employment rose by 15%. This is a decline in output per man of nearly 5%. This argues not only the need of technical reforms but a revolution in thought on the part of the British worker.

The very optimistic press reports on Britain's industrial production released just prior to Sir Stafford Cripps' recent visit here were a bit baffling to me until I saw the full text of Sir Stafford's comments. Included was this statement "The present increases have been achieved almost entirely by an increase in the total numbers of the population who are working. A further increase in the labour force cannot be expected thus increased productivity per man is the very urgent next step in Britain's recovery."

On this score it was most interesting last week to meet executives of one of Britain's leading woollen mills, who said they had modernized their plants, simplified managerial direction, won the response of the workers who had given them a 23% increase in production so far this year. They had studied American methods to advantage and vis-a-vis had contributed something they thought to their United States associates — and that was better methods in the quantity production of quality goods.

Will the Labour Government be re-elected? An Opinion Survey taken by a Labour newspaper brought out the result that were an election held today the Conservatives would have 49% of the vote, Labour 38%, Liberals 13%, with the middle class and the women the decisive factor. These two groups apparently feel the Labour Govenment has been concerned too much with its own interest rather than that of the nation as a whole and the women have taken the brunt of the frustration growing out of the bureaucratic controls.

One thing you can do, keep on sending parcels to Britain. The diet of 2560 calories per person per day is inadequate and monotonous. Your gift will be appreciated out of all proportion.

Rome is a fascinating city for the tourist. Untouched by war, it seemed in strange contrast to the austerity of London. Everything was bright and fresh and for the tourist at least there was all the food you could possibly want, and deliciously cooked.

I believe we should not feel too secure in the results of the last election in Italy which confirmed Premier Gasperi's Christian Democrats in power.

There are three factors which must not be overlooked in appraising the Italian situation: First, there were 8,000,000 Communist votes in the election, nearly one-third of the total. Secondly, there are 2,000,000 unemployed in Italy today and a large number of the population living at subsistence levels. There is also what can be called over-employment in industry. This grows out of a government order approved by the Allied Military Government in force since 1945. This does not permit a reduction of staffs in industry, even when there is no work for them. The Fiat Motor-car Works, for example, are today carrying more than 6,000 unemployed employees on their staff.

Thus the cost of production is too high, adversely affecting Italy's urgently needed export trade. Further, this over-employment demoralizes workers, for those who do work do not feel encouraged by seeing other workers standing idly by.

Thirdly, there is Communist domination of the major labour unions, which has prompted strikes, disorders, wage demands and halts in production.

To these negative factors should be added Italy's age old problem of over-population with an agricultural economy insufficient to maintain the nation's food supply.

On the positive side, three years ago Italy had no state, no administration. The North and the South had suffered heavy war destruction. Marked industrial progress has been achieved. And the spirit of the people is good. The great majority of the Italians are faithful, hard-working people, attached to their jobs. One interesting development in Italy is that the heads of a number of firms have visited the United States since the war and have observed their own need for newer mass production methods.

The strength of the government shown during the recent Communist inspired strikes and public disorders indicates that it is ruling with a firm hand, obviously backed by a majority of public support. We should also note the absence of Communists in key government positions, notably where they could effect internal security. That in itself is a safeguard against events as they happened in Czechoslovakia.

This brings us to Czechoslovakia. Prague is a city of old-world charm. Would that that were now so; but the old world has given way to the new.

If one had not been in Nazi Germany in 1935 when all was sweetness and light, and had not been fooled by the outward appearance of things, one could superficially have concluded that all was well in Prague. Life goes on. The streets are crowded with many still pleasantly-dressed people; the shop windows promise more than the counters within fulfill. And every effort was being made to please the tourist, prior to the XI Sokol Gymnastic Festival. Government, press and other officials were most co-operative to me personally.

But then you get behind the facade of people, to discover the real meaning of the bloodless coup which on February 24th last poured Czechoslovakia into the mold of Marx, if there be any resemblance between Marx's theories and the ruthless realities of today's Communism.

This coup which brought the nation under Communist control was largely "an inside job". Moscow took no direct part, save for the timely presence of one or two key figures, because it knew the Communist leaders in Czechoslovakia were equal to the task.

The liquidation of the opposition is under way. The secret police, forced labor, the concentration camp, are tremendously persuasive against the dissenter. So is the simple device of a man's losing his job and being unable to get another.

Having seen the throaty mob acclaim Hitler in his day, it was apparent to me that there was no crowd hysteria for Klement Gottwald the day he was elected president. Admittedly it was difficult to put the same dramatic emphasis into "Nazder President Gottwold" as into "Heil Hitler". Actually, there were no large numbers on the streets. Most of the Czechs went silently about their business.

One old lady asked me if I thought there would be war with Russia soon. I thought not. She said that was too bad. During the German occupation, she explained, you knew whom your enemies were and you had the confident hope of liberation. Today, you did not know who were Communists among your own people and there was no hope of being freed.

Czechoslovakia is embarking on a Five-Year plan. Its greatest significance to us is the switch from the traditional light industries—glass, toys, gloves and textiles—to heavy industry.

The new plan calls for a big increase in steel production. Most of the new equipment and raw materials for this must come from the Western world, already short of supply.

For months a $25 million strip mill for Czechoslovakia's steel industry has been nearing completion in the United States. The great question now is, will it be delivered, in view of political events which have occurred since it was ordered. A recent United Nations Economic Commission report urges that a revival of trade across the Iron Curtain is essential to European recovery. But should we build up Czechoslovakia as an arsenal of Communism?

In 1945 the major industries in Czechoslovakia were nationalized. This was in part a device to re-establish their ownership since the Germans had acquired share control during the occupation. Following the Communist Coup in February, however, all industries employing 50 or over have been nationalized.

What happens to the owner or management in such an industry? They may do one of three things . . . become communists and continue in their jobs; or, because of the shortage of good managerial material in industry, they may be permitted to continue as managers if they agree to take an "objective" view of Communism. Or, if they refuse, they are dismissed from their own business and their jobs. And something new has been added. The former owner goes home and is called upon in due course. His Communist visitors say "This is a lovely home, beautiful furnishings, valuable pictures, all purchased, of course, from the earnings of the now nationalized business. Thank you very much." And they take them.

An illuminating interview with Zdenek Fierlinger, then Minister of Industry, recently made Second Deputy Prime Minister, gives us a revealing insight into the Party line. Formerly in the diplomatic corps, he had visited Montreal, Quebec City, Murray Bay and had called on the late William Howard Taft, former president of the United States, there.

Later I learned that many of his fellow countrymen do him the doubtful honour of calling him the Quisling of Czechoslovakia, with apologies to Quisling, who at least was what he claimed to be. Fierlinger, they say, was two-faced. He entrenched himself with the Russians during his stay as Ambassador to Russia throughout World War II, and sold out the Social Democratic party to the Communists in February—which was quite a feat, at that, because he had been thrown out of the leadership of the Social Democrats in November last. He returned by the usual strong-arm methods when the success of the February coup was assured. Just for the record, he was Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia in 1945-46.

He was most cordial and suave, with a keen sense of humour.

It was most gracious of him to see me, a stranger, I began. True I did have the honour of representing a leading publishing house in Canada. But I would be reporting in our weekly business publication whose views, I had to confess, were opposed to his own.

His reply was a classic. "Naturally, its views differ; but that does not matter, since capitalism is doomed." He went on to say "Capitalism, of course, carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction."

"May I return the compliment about Communism", I replied. "Has it not demonstrated two fundamental seeds of its own destruction: One, historically it has not improved the standard of living of the people compared with a free society. Secondly, there is the most challenging of all its contradictions—that it limits the full range of man's mind and spirit because he must not contradict the state."

He answered, "On the first point, you will see that the Czech standard of living will rise with the whole energy and will of the working people devoted to production. Russia, despite the devastating setback of the war, has brought her peoples infinite advantage compared with the Czarist days." (But still the standard of living does not stack up by any comparison.)

"On the second point, modern man serves his own interests best when he is one with the majority's concept of what is best for the state."

Superficially his latter answer looks alright. It evens fools some people over here. I have had them say to me "Isn't that the same as our democratic concept of the rule of the majority?" The answer is emphatically "no" because in the Communist view an alleged majority entitles you to persecute the minority. This persecution of the minority is the most pernicious of the Communist doctrines and is the simplest and most effective formula for clarifying the meaning of applied Communism.

Earlier in the interview Minister Fierlinger had said—"Who would have thought, 40 years ago, that the then-ridiculed Socialists would come to power. Or, for that matter, who would have conceded Christ's followers a chance at the beginning?"

On this latter point, the Minister was most vulnerable. Because Christ's daring view in the totalitarian Roman Empire, of the dignity and worth of each individual, is precisely why it won against such odds; even as the Communists fear most the free spirit of man.

There is great good will among many Czechs towards Canada. One evidence is the many enquiries about emigrating to Canada. And it was still possible to obtain the necessary passports and exit permits from the Czech

Government. But Canada requires that relatives provide the ocean ticket and proof of financial stability to take care of the newcomers. Ninety to one hundred and twenty a month were obtaining permits to emigrate to Canada. In most cases they must leave the bulk of their worldly possessions behind.

The International Service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation came in for a good word. Typical was the unsolicited comment of a waiter in a restaurant. He asked if I were English. I replied that I was a Canadian. He said he had became familiar with Montreal through our International CBC broadcasts. He liked these broadcasts for the objectivity of our news reporting. Groping for words he put it rather quaintly "Canada is a country without envy". He continued: "Perhaps that is why your news is unprejudiced. Keep up that feature. We rely on it."

Czechoslovakia commands our sympathy. As one older person put it "We are Communists on paper, but not in our hearts".

Germany is the subject of a whole address in itself. Therefore I will try to highlight only what seemed of greatest interest.

First was the extent of the bomb damage. One has to see it to comprehend in any sense just how stupendous it was. I saw it first in Frankfurt. Speaking to a very able German lawyer there—he had represented the new Germany at the New York Herald-Tribune's Forum last spring—I mentioned that his city had taken quite a beating. He replied that I had seen nothing yet. Subsequent visits to Essen in the Ruhr and Berlin proved his point. In the latter city the main streets only are cleared. There is unbelievable damage.

"But you get used to living in such ruins", he said. "My children, for instance, find it exciting to play in the rubble. I took my eight-year-old boy to Heidelberg last week. After we had walked around the unbombed town for a few minutes he startled me somewhat by saying—'But, Daddy, where do the children play'."

Secondly, we are busy at great cost trying to aid Germany's recovery. For three very good reasons, to get the load off our own backs; to aid European recovery; to prevent the spread of Communism.

The United States share alone for 1948, for the cost of essential imports into Germany, will exceed one billion dollars. Britain's share is seventy million dollars. Offsetting this total in part is the income from German exports which has amounted to 409 million dollars since January, 1947.

The above, of course, does not include the cost of maintaining the occupational and administration forces in Germany, and now can be added the expense of supplying the Western Sections of Berlin by air. In addition there are five hundred and fifty millions of Marshall Aid dollars.

No wonder I found the view expressed quite frequently in Germany by Americans, the British and Germans—"Will the American taxpayer get tired of paying." The most potent reason why he will not get tired lies in the alternative. A continued prostrate Germany is going to menace the North American security because it will adversely affect the whole of Europe and will be to Russia's advantage. As a key American economic advisor put it "Germany is the thrust bearing of Europe. It is the abrasive point. Here the issue of Europe will be decided. Germany's economic recovery and stability is of the utmost importance to all of us of the West."

Thirdly, how successful has been Germany's industrial recovery? It has lagged behind that of other European countries, similarly war-damaged. With 1936 as 100, industrial production in Bizonal Germany (U.S.-British) was 26 in January, 1946. It is 50 today. Western Europe, excluding Germany, is 99% today. Why the lag? One of the key reasons has been met by the new currency reform. It is difficult for us who live on this North American continent with its sound currency to realize what it is like to live in a country where simple commodities had a more stable accepted value than currency.

I was in Frankfurt the week-end when the new currency reform was announced. A German friend came by train to see me. He was able to purchase his ticket with the old reichsmarks. But I had none of the new currency. Nevertheless, he was glad to accept compensation for his coming in cigarettes, chocolate bars and silk stockings. His hotel bill I paid in chocolate bars, soap and cigarettes. The manager and manageress, the owners of the hotel, were tremendously excited by what seemed very little to me but was largess to them.

The new currency, our Deutschmark, however, will have far-reaching effects on the German economy in the Western zones. In the first place it has provided an incentive for manufacturers to produce and, in fact, a large supply of goods immediately came out of hoarding for consumer purchase.

It provides the incentive for the individual German to work, to save, and to buy. Two important factors are fundamental, however: First, the confidence of the German people in the new currency. It is backed only by their "will to work", and the resources of Germany. But it differs from Adolph Hitler's former reichsmark currency which was similarly backed, by the fact that it is a controlled currency, limited in issue, and, therefore, has a scarcity value. Secondly, no currency long has validity without a supply of consumer goods to meet consumer demands and desires.

There was gratifying evidence of acceptance of the currency. Consequently, the new impetus of the production in German industry with needed raw materials supplied in part through Marshall Aid plus the arranging of the import of a steady flow of consumer goods, will help to solve the second point.

Commenting on this, Sir Cecil Weir, President on the British side of the Economic Sub-Commission in Berlin told me: "I am hopeful that with Marshall Aid providing over $200 million dollars of imports into Germany in the fiscal year ending June, 1949, that Bi-Zonal (American and

British) industrial production may reach 70-75% of 1936 totals."

The currency reform has far reaching effects in other ways. For instance, industry in Germany has carried on its staff frequently more personnel than needed, discipline of workers has been low and absenteeism not dealt with too severely.

I learned of one large manufacturer who called his entire staff together and said, "I do not propose to dismiss any of you. I do propose, however, to watch the will to work, the quality and quantity of your production. They will be the decisive factors in your future with us."

This means that greater efficiency will reduce production costs and consumer prices in Germany. This reform has had another marked effect, that of largely eliminating the black market. This is having a great impact on the morale of the German worker who frankly resented seeing the black marketeers enjoy a degree of luxury he, the worker, could not attain.

Evidence of the effect on prices of the new currency were given to me thus. In '39 with the reichsmark at 30 cents bicycles sold 80 to 100 marks. Recent black market prices reached 3,000 marks. Today the price is 120 of the new Deutschmarks. Similarly men's suits ready-made in 1939 were 80 to 100 reichsmarks; black market 3,000 to 4,000; today 100 marks.

Fourthly, another factor in Germany's slow industrial recovery and perhaps the most important, is food—or rather the lack of it. My German friends, for instance, lived in a small community. Said he "The basic ration of 1560 calories per day exists only on paper. Actually it is around 800 to 900. For the last month our family had no meat, no milk, no potatoes. The bread ration has been raised to 12.5 grams per month and the sugar ration raised to 500 grams per person per month. We have had some rations of fish. Even though we live more or less in a farming community we have had no vegetables. The farmers have enough but they have become Germany's most hardboiled people. I am not complaining, I am simply stating the facts."

The food supply, therefore, is an ever present factor in the daily lives of the German worker and his family. The Ruhr miner is getting a substantially better diet, although this is still insufficient for sustained manual labour. Here on the North American continent we look upon 4,500 calories per person per day as a minimum to sustain good health. The Rhur miner is getting 4,000 calories, some 800 calories less than his British counterpart.

The miner is responding to the latest incentive programme which gives him extra food parcels, including fats and meat—plus the availability of extra clothing for himself and his family. I have observed since that the production target of 290,000 tons per day has exceeded 300,000 tons.

But it is conceded that 400,000 tons per day is a realisable objective and this amount is essential before Germany's industrial recovery programme and export quotas are full out.

Here is an American view of one very close to the production question. "Coal in the Ruhr is a complex substance and creates complex problems," he said. "For instance, it produces political situations. Take the de-Nazification programme. This has gone to extremes and has touched the lives of a number of first rate people because they had been listed as members of the Nazi party, which in many cases was a mere formality. As a result all the smart boys in the mining industry who knew how to get coal production, through long years of experience, are not now available to us including both workers and those of managerial levels."

He went on to say that whilst the Communists were in the minority, nevertheless, they had pretty successfully wormed their way into the Works Councils and were a factor in deterring production. He felt it was time the administration of the mines got tough with the Communists but this had not been done in part because of the Labour Government in Britain. One might remember that the head of the British Mine Workers Union in Britain is himself a Communist.

He was also inclined to think that Labour had been given too much leeway in the Ruhr but also wished to emphasize that the Labour Unions had done a rather remarkably good job.

He mentioned the efforts made by the Communists to stop the incentive programmes, where the Ruhr miners were given extra food parcels. The men themselves had voted to work on Sunday and the Communists had made a tremendous effort to stop them.

He spoke of a meeting of the Union people around his desk at which the Vice-president of the Union was a Communist, who was loud in his condemnation of the new incentive plans. So the American said he walked around the table and said to the Communist, "If I understand you, you are completely against this incentive programme." When the Communist replied in the affirmative, he said "Alright, we'll publish your views—that you are against incentive food packages—in the local paper." My American informant said that after that the Communist never said a further word.

He went on to discuss one problem, that of reparations which I ran across from many sources and always with the same view. He said that for sheer madness the current dismantling of industrial plants was tops to destroy those German industrial plants of war potential. But the point which seared this man's soul was the fact that we were vitally concerned with Germany's industrial recovery, were spending millions to that end, yet we were spending time and money to destroy plants already in existence which could be used to build equipment which would improve production as soon as we could supply the raw materials.

The question of the ownership of the mines in the Ruhr is also affecting coal production. It has an effect upon management, as they do not know for whom they are working. The decision regarding ownership has been left to the German authorities to decide. Some of the management were recommending public ownership because of the immense amount of capital involved in reconditioning the mines. The companies have been denuded of capital and of liquid assets.

Although the decision was being left to the Germans as to the final form of ownership, there were among the Western allies wide differences of opinion. Heretofore, the mines did work in cartels and syndicates although non-political. The British favoured nationalization of the mines, the creating of a giant monopoly. The American view was exactly the contrary. The French were satisfied with any system which neutralized the war making potential of the Ruhr area.

Last in Berlin in 1937, revisiting it was a most impressive experience. Touring the Soviet sector included that part of Berlin I had known best—Unter der Linden, the Wilhelmstrasse, Alexander Platz, etc. A little narrow gauge construction train was busy going through the front door of what had been the British Embassy, now in ruins as was Hitler's Chancellery. The Russians have blasted his air raid shelter. But the site of the bunker remains where the bodies crisped into oblivion the "one thousand years of Nazidom."

I confess I had flown into Berlin with some trepidation—in an R.A.F. plane in which I was one of three civilians. The city itself, even the Soviet sector, was a bit of an anti-climax. Superficially it seemed so normal, but behind the curtain of normalcy was the struggle which has now been submitted to the United Nations.

The spirit of the people of Berlin was most encouraging. For instance, they were accepting our new currency in the Western sectors, which headed up the Berlin crisis and were refusing to believe the Soviet claims for their new mark. Our Deutschemark was commanding 18 to 20 of the Soviet marks. Those in the Western sectors and many in the Soviet sector obviously are anti-Communist and fervently hoping there will be no breach of our decision to stay in Berlin, not that they love us more but they dislike us less. I met a German woman in her 40's who with her younger sister had gone through the entire war in Berlin. Said she "We have relatives in the United States who are urging us to go out there. I am a Berliner born and bred. Here I shall stay. But I hope most devoutly that the Western Powers stay too."

People ask why has Russia been so arbitrary in its attitude over Berlin. Why did it institute the blockade in the first place. There are three reasons. First, she had every strategic advantage because of our lack of road and rail access and she underestimated the amazing results we have achieved with the air lift. Secondly, to get us out of Berlin would consolidate eastern Germany to her military advantage, as well as having great effect on the morale of all Germans—and to the advantage of the Communist cause in such unstable situations as you have, for instance, in France and Italy as well as consolidating more strongly the satellite states.

But, thirdly, and this was the powerful immediate reason. When the German people in the Western Zones and in our Western Sections in Berlin showed a decided preference for our new Deutschmark currency it was essential to the Russians that they prevent consumer goods getting into Berlin shops because with an oasis of goods in our sectors in Berlin in a desert of scarcity in the Soviet sectors, no amount of Russian propaganda could convince the Berliners that Communism was the better way of life.

What of the German people? Have they got over their war making instinct? One able British observer in Berlin mentioned he thought the terrific destruction of the homeland in World War II might very well prove to be a deterrent on future German aggression. Especially was this so since Germany was in the path of the conflict between the World's two giants—Soviet Russia and the United States.

I asked the same question of an astute German. He said, "You know the capacity we Germans have demonstrated to be led around by the nose. Presently there is strong anti-Russian feeling among the Germans outside the Soviet zone—and a rather refreshing evidence of German morale within the Soviet sector. Should any more of Germany come under Soviet control, however, history would seem to lead us to conclude that the Germans would join the Russians as a result of propaganda and the instinct for power which is always held out as a bait in war. It can be said that we Germans want to be in the big league. The Western powers offer us the best hope for the future, but we would urge that the authority of the present military government be mitigated. In effect, our attempts towards democratic government will gain experience best through authority and responsibility. Today Germany has no clear cut administration and there is a division of authority. You can't get competent people without their having authority."

And he made this candid comment in reply to my question re Germans feeling a sense of war guilt. "The people were shaken in a moral sense. Not so had Germany won the war. Today, though, they see less tendency to nationalism in Germany than in many neighbouring states. And their sense of guilt is further mitigated by the knowledge of today's Russian concentration camps."

It is a very great decision to make whether or not the occupational forces should be removed from Germany, with perhaps the odds in favour of doing so, at the same time this time keeping a more watchful eye on what is developing. There are 1,000,000 de-Nazified Germans between the ages of 24 and 35 who are not permitted to do other than manual labour. They represent a pretty disgruntled group and could become mercenary soldiers for any leader.

It was encouraging to find that German youth to some degree was coming under the leadership of both the Protestant and Catholic Churches and that youth groups such as the Boy and Girl Scouts, and Y.M.C.A. movements are making some headway. As long as family units, however, are faced by insufficient income and food, this strikes at the very heart of the moral integrity of people because even parents condone acts outside the strictly moral code when the welfare of the family and its health are concerned.

What of the issue of peace or war? I did not find any top-ranking authority but felt that war with Russia was inevitable if we did not mobilize to meet the threat of Russian aggression.

Even that might not prevent war because of pressures from within Russia, because of the importance to Russia of preventing the success of Marshall Aid to European recovery and because Russia would profit from the dislocation and chaos, in any case, following war, assuming that the Russian leaders themselves survived. We are winning the "cold war".

On my motor trip to Essen the guide was a most likeable lad in his early thirties. I said to him, "You speak English very well." He replied, "I should, for I was six years in Canada." He went on to ask, "How is Sunnyside and Casa Loma in Toronto." When I enquired in what capacity he had been in Canada, it was somewhat of a surprise to have him say, "As a prisoner of war". Since this did not jibe with his question concerning Toronto, I asked him for his story. He said that in the latter days of the war he had been in a lumbering camp north of Schreiber, Ontario. Along with another prisoner he engaged illegally in the trapping of furs and sold these to the Indians. He had bought an identification card from an intoxicated Indian of his acquaintance and thus acquired the Indian's name of Simon Desmoulins. He escaped from the lumber camp with $250 in his pocket.

Arriving in Toronto he lined up at Selective Service but before he got to the desk, a man came along and asked him how he would like to work for him. Feeling a bit nervous about going to the desk, he accepted and worked for seven months with a firm in the galvanizing business.

He asked "Do you know Joe ......, the welterweight champion of Ontario." When I replied in the negative he said, "I was his sparring partner at the Y.M.C.A."

Later he came to Montreal on a visit and with the cessation of war gave himself up in order to get back to see his parents, whom he had not heard from. "You have a wonderful country in Canada. I wish with all my heart I was back there."

I have seen an Europe in which there is vitality, evidence of recovery and hope for the future but there is also fear, hunger and desperation and, as in Czechoslovakia the death of values that had great meaning to them and to us.

I have seen Communism at first hand again. Their's is a phony democracy. They use—or misuse—the great words such as "the peoples democracy" that have a great tradition of human freedom to us but in practice with Communism these words do not mean the same thing but a ruthless denial of the rights of the individual.

Last week a young Czechoslovakian girl who arrived in Montreal put the case with simple eloquence. "It is true I was sick and got free hospitalization, but that is no compensation for the loss of my personal freedom". She knew what freedom meant because she had seen her friends taken from their homes and never heard of again.

The Socialism of England is being tried in the one place in the world where there is the longest tradition of love of freedom and political wisdom. Its advocates believe that the large-scale monopoly of the state can achieve more for all and without affecting the personal freedom, opportunity for reward and the standard of living of the individual. Personally, I believe the experience of socialism and the instinct of self-reliance of the British peoples will result in a change of government.

But it remained for a Czechoslovakian in Prague to put most succinctly the values of our way of life on this continent. Said he: "What the authoritarians here do not realize is that there is such a thing as evolutionary capitalism.

"Capitalism on your continent can and does learn. Since the depression of the '30's it has greatly broadened its humanitarian base, its team work and partnership with its workers. It has retained the essential freedoms of the workers and the amazing power of production of your system. Some planning is necessary in any economy but yours has succeeded precisely because it has no stifling overall plan but flexibility at the point of production.

"Here in Czechoslovakia we are witnessing first the liquidation of the middle class which is the key to any successful revolution. For a time there will be a classless society and then the new privileged group arises made up of the successful bureaucrats, the Communist Party leaders, and the successful managerial types.

"In the meantime, the lot of the worker worsens, he loses his prized freedoms, his union right of criticism, and the standard of living will fall."

One returns to this favoured land with a feeling of immense gratitude for our material blessings and for the spirit of free men and women that has made them possible.

But the price of peace is preparedness. We have been speaking of our European neighbours. What kind of neighbours are we? The name of Canada stands high for its past generosity. I do not believe we can or should escape a further share of the cost of aiding European recovery. This means in part that as we benefit from European purchases resultant from Marshall Aid I believe we will ultimately be required to underwrite a part of this responsibility. So far I have been talking essentially about trade but we must not overlook our share in the underlying problem of defence and on a much larger scale than we presently envision. This is going to cost us something as taxpayers, although current surpluses will enable us to meet immediate demands.

But it will be a small price if through preparedness we can keep the peace.

A writer in the New York Times recently referred to an apparent shibboleth that has gripped many of mankind, turning them toward the sheltering bosom of the state. He called it a "fear of freedom". Let it never be said of us Canadians that we are afraid of freedom. But let us remember our pioneer and self-reliant past. Ours is a great heritage—economic, political and spiritual. We must share our abundance and be vigilant for our priceless freedoms. Thus shall this continent with its partners of the Empire tradition be a hope for all mankind—and our Canada remain the true north, strong and free.

"CERTAIN ASPECTS OF BRITISH LIFE AND THOUGHT"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR ARTHUR SHULDHAM REDFERN,
K.C.V.O., C.M.G.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, October 28th, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen: The Empire Club always considers it an honour when distinguished gentlemen from England visiting Canada are kind enough to so arrange their itinerary to permit them to address a regular meeting of our Club. Today is another one of those happy occasions.

Our guest speaker for today is Sir Shuldham Redfern, who is no stranger to Canadians, having occupied the post of Secretary to the Governor-General from 1935 to 1945.

Sir Shuldham was educated at Winchester and Trinity College, Cambridge. He served as a Major in World War I with the Royal Flying Corps and later with the Royal Air Force.

In 1920 he joined the Sudan Political Service and filled many important positions with distinction, concluding his service in the Sudan as Governor of Kassala Province in 1934.

In recognition of his services in the Sudan, Sir Shuldham was created an officer of the Order of the Nile.

In 1947 Sir Shuldham was appointed Director of the Commonwealth Department of the British Council, which is a Government sponsored organization aimed at spreading knowledge of British culture and thought throughout the Commonwealth.

Today Sir Shuldham is going to deal with certain cultural relations between this country and Great Britain.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Sir Shuldham Redfern, K.C.V.O., C.M.G., who has chosen as his subject "Certain Aspects of British Life and Thought."

Before I say anything about the subject of my address, there is one thing I would like to mention to you which has nothing to do with the purpose of my visit. I speak simply as an ordinary Englishman visiting this country. Now, I have been sent food parcels by friends in Canada and before I left England last week, I though it would be interesting to find out how many other people were getting these parcels. I discovered that since 1940, Canadians have sent 10,929,000 gift food parcels to individuals and more than 54,485,000 pounds of gift food in bulk between December, 1945 and March, 1948.

Now, those figures are staggering figures and I think that the first thing that anyone from the Old Country would wish to say to a public audience such as this in Canada is "Thank you". We in England are not starving, we have an efficient and well administered rationing system. Everyone gets the same and it is absolutely fair. According to the scientists and statisticians, it is adequate and it has made us into a healthy nation but it is terribly dull and I cannot tell you how much your parcels are appreciated. They are appreciated particularly by old people living alone who cannot spend the morning standing in a queue, like my wife often does and comes home with a pot of jam. And you can readily understand how these parcels are appreciated by families with children. I am told that you are setting up a special organization called the "United Emergency Fund for Britain" in order to ensure that these parcels are efficiently and economically distributed. That sort of thing just leaves us speechless with admiration. As a people, we are not effusive in our gratitude, but I can assure you that we are deeply grateful for all you have done for us and are doing for us to help win the second Battle of Britain.

Now, the subject of my address, "Cultural Relations", is, I would think, rather forbidding. I don't care much for the words "cultural" and "culture". They carry with them the suspicion of self-righteousness and gentility. There is something a bit high-hatted about them—something that suggests intellectual snobbery. They are not quite genuine and what is far worse, they sound dreadfully pompous and boring.

It is a pity, I think, that the expression "Cultural Relations" should have such unfortunate associations, because it represents something which is of great importance at this time. It represents an attempt to define a greater mutual understanding of peoples and on that depends the peace of the world which is another way of saying *"The survival of the world"*. As we all know, peace is no chance growth; it has to be planned and built up and I am sure that there is no material which is stronger or more durable in the building up of the structure of peace than an imaginative programme of cultural relations.

Now, we are all agreed that science has brought us much closer together than we have ever been before. All countries and people are our neighbours whether we like it or not, space and time have been almost obliterated. You can, for instance, escape as I did the other day from the fogs and mist and general austerity of post-war London, get into a comfortable Canadian airplane and reach Canada in a matter not of days but of hours. Nothing has ever been known like that before but how many people can actually do it? What advantage are these phenomenally rapid means of communication if only a few people can make use of them? Centuries ago you could travel all over the known world without any restrictions in the way of passports, visas and currency controls. People were then truly international, they even spoke the same language (Latin), but today, in spite of all these technical advances that have been made, the peoples of the world are reduced to a state of immobility almost unprecedented in the annals of mankind. They are hemmed in by the barriers they have been putting up themselves after the purely physical barriers have been successfully destroyed. What an absurd and anomalous position, but the result is very serious for it means that as we are all separated by these artificial barriers which we have erected, there is a danger of our working and thinking in watertight compartments. There is a danger of severe restrictions in the interchange of thought and ideas and knowledge. There is a danger, and a very real danger, that misunderstanding may be the inevitable conclusion.

Can you wonder that the world is in its present appalling and confused state? But this 20th Century of ours ought to be a century in which there is no excuse for not knowing how men and women in other lands live and how they look at life; how they spend their leisure; what sort of music they listen to; what sort of pictures they see; what sort of places they go to; what sort of books they read; what their homes are like and their food; what wages they get and, in fact, how they live.

People in our country no longer think of Canadians in terms of Eskimos and Red Indians, and people in Canada no longer think of us as high-hatted individuals wearing eye glasses and striped pants and living in medieval castles. All these romantic notions are things of the past.

The night before President Roosevelt died he wrote these words:

> "Today, science has brought all the different quarters of the globe so close together that it is impossible to isolate then one from another. Today, we are faced with the pre-eminent fact that if civilization is to survive we must cultivate the science of human relationships, the ability of all peoples of all kinds to live together and work together in the same world at peace.

You will no doubt say that there have always been unofficial contacts either by organizations or individuals between the nations of the world, just as there have been and still are official contacts. That is true, but until recently the official and formal channels between countries have been on political, commercial or military levels. The other channels of communication are liable to become impeded and blocked. It is therefore important that they should be widened and freed from debris and that they should contain a free flow of material which will produce understanding and not misunderstanding so that sympathy and friendship, rather than prejudice and hatred, may be disseminated throughout the world.

I, myself, do not believe that there is ever real hatred between peoples of different countries, no matter how critical the international situation may be. There is often profound ignorance and ignorance produces prejudice and prejudice is sometimes mistaken for enmity but if you can dispel ignorance and promote knowledge and understanding, then you have undermined the causes of hostility. But it is no good just talking about these things. No country can expect to be understood by others if it remains passive and aloof. The most enlightened foreign policy cannot possibly be successful unless it is developed against a background of knowledge.

Now, in 1935, we in Britain came to the conclusion that in addition to the ordinary channels of communication between governments, there was need of another channel, official it is true, but non-political and non-economic. You may call it "cultural" if you like, but the idea was to make the life and thought of Britain more widely known overseas and an organization called the "British Council" was inaugurated by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom by funds granted by parliamentary grants. You see, at present Great Britain is in an anomalous position, it is both rich and poor. It is poor in material resources, in food, money and raw materials but it is immensely rich in what one might call its "cultural heritage" and that great store house of treasure is being added to every day. Times of stress always seem to stimulate the creative works of mankind and that is true of the present time. We, in Britain, feel that we possess a great wealth of drama and music and fine arts, and we have recently created a whole range of new social services. In scientific achievements our progress has, I suggest, been spectacular.

People often think of us in England as living rather drab, rationed lives but the other day I counted up the number of plays, operas, concerts, ballets, picture galleries and recitals in London and I found that in every case there were far more than there were in New York. Britain has, in fact, become the world's greatest source of cultural creative effort.

Now, we are not better people than anyone else but we have gathered up these things over a long period and now it is surely common sense that we should export from what we have in abundance. Of course, each country has a strong belief in the importance of its own culture and a desire to have other countries know and appreciate it. That is a worthy belief and a healthy desire, because there is no doubt that the improvement of cultural relations between countries leads to better economic and political relations.

Now, what exactly does one mean by cultural activities. Well, they include the interchange of technical experts, professors, teachers, students and leaders in various fields of intellectual and artistic expression. They include the exchange of books and other printed material, lectures, concerts and exhibitions. We believe that the imaginative and skillful development of cultural relations can assure a system of national interpretation on a reciprocal basis and promote understanding, friendship and peace. The British Council, to which I belong, exists for that very purpose.

We hear a lot about what is called the "Iron Curtain" but the British Council has been responsible for displaying behind the Iron Curtain all manner of British cultural activities and they have been most warmly appreciated. We want to break down not only the Iron Curtain but all curtains, no matter what they are made of. And so we seek not only to convey knowledge of Britain to other countries but to encourage other countries to make themselves better known to Britain. If it is true that you can learn something about our achievements, it is equally true that we can learn something of yours and we are anxious to do so.

And so, within this general field including the humanities, the arts and sciences, the British Council seeks to achieve this, at the present time, by encouraging the exchange of ideas between technical, professional and educational groups in Britain and similar groups in countries overseas. The British Council is our official agency for these exchanges. It is in no sense an instrument of propaganda for the Government of the day; it has nothing to do with politics; and has no concern with economic and financial relations. And although it is financed by a grant in aid from the U.K. treasury, the conduct of its affairs is placed in the hands of an executive committee representative of all branches of current thought.

The Council is, moreover, assisted by a number of experienced advisory committees which link it up with every phase of our national life. It has representatives in over sixty countries and it can also grant scholarships overseas to enable students from all countries to visit Britain and carry out a course of study of their own choosing. And we also invite to Britain as our guests visitors and groups of visitors so that they can see and study whatever they want in our country.

For example, a young Australian artist came to see me the other day in London with a note from our representative in Melbourne. He had worked his way by sea from Australia, but had never been in England before and he wanted to study at a good school of art. Left to his own devices, he might have spent weeks trying to find a school that would take him in but yet our Fine Arts Department managed to fix him up within half an hour of his first appearance and he is now a student at one of our best art schools in London.

A few months ago the director of the Canadian National Gallery came over to England and asked if we could arrange to send over exhibitions of contemporary British drawings. That exhibition was sent over, I saw it two days ago in the National Gallery in Ottawa and you will be able to see it here.

Last winter I was asked if we could find an adjudicator for the Dominion Drama Festival. Now, that is not an easy task for an adjudicator not only has to be highly competent and knowledgable, he must also be bilingual. But we managed to arrange for Mr. Robert Speaight to come over to Canada and from all accounts his visit was an unqualified success. When he came back to England he was tremendously enthusiastic about the quality and quantity of dramatic talent in this country.

And so I decided that we should send to Canada one of the very best dramatic companies we possess, the "Old Vic" Company. As a result, Sir Cedric Hardwicke and Dame Edith Evans are coming over here in January with the "Old Vic". Now the "Old Vic" does not consist of two stars and a tail, all members of the Company are accomplished actors and actresses. They are the best we have and I want to emphasize that any project we send over here will be the best possible quality. We shall never send you or take part in sending a second rate show. One of the great events of the year in Great Britain is the Edinburgh Festival. Famous orchestras, conductors, artists and players come from all parts and as my Scottish friends will know, there could be no finer setting for a festival of arts than the city of Edinburgh. One of the finest orchestras at Edinburgh this year was a small English orchestra, the Boyd Neel orchestra. Last year they went to Australia and New Zealand under British Council auspices and were an overwhelming success. Those who heard them say they have never heard such music so wonderfully played. The Boyd Neel orchestra stole the show at Edinburgh this year and it is probably the best small collection of orchestral players in the world. I am hoping to be able to send them to Canada on a tour about this time next year.

Another of our ventures in which we are particularly interested is the Sadler's Wells Ballet. They have toured the Continent of Europe on both sides of the Iron Curtain and have given performances before some of the most critical audiences in the world. The general opinion is that the Sadler's Wells Ballet is quite incomparable. Even the Russians who saw it said it was better than the old Russian Ballet. I am hoping to be able to arrange for the Sadler's Wells Ballet to come over to Canada next year.

These are just a few of the things that the British council arranges. We want to submit these things to your critical judgment. If you like them, well, we shall be delighted. If you do not like them, we hope you will criticize them—it will do them no harm.

In introducing some of our cultural achievements to you and hoping that you will reciprocate by sending some of your cultural achievements to Great Britain, we believe that we are engaged in good and useful work. I hope that Canadians will tell me what they want my Council to do and if we can, we will do it. Canada and Great Britain—we have the same great traditions of democracy, of tolerance and respect for one another, of humour and fair play. These are treasured gifts in the torn world of our time.

Before I left London a member of the London press, not always friendly towards the British Council, called up Canada House in Trafalgar Square and asked them if I had been invited to Canada by the Canadian Government. He got the answer from Canada House that no one had to be invited to Canada, it was a free country and they would gladly welcome me or anyone else. Now, that seems quite an ordinary and natural reply. But it is tremendously momentous in these days when you think of the number of countries which are closed from the free interchange of ideas and persons.

When I asked your Secretary, Mr. Hyde Bennett, what he would like me to talk about, he said, "You can talk about anything you like." No, there are many countries where that would not be possible and so we have their great advantage of freedom of communication and intercourse between our peoples. Let us see that we make the best possible use of it so that both together and individually we can make a worthwhile contribution to the peace of the world.

These things of which I have spoken,—mutual knowledge and understanding, the interchange of ideas and an appreciation of our common heritage, are among the threads which bind our Commonwealth together. Whether you call it Empire or British Commonwealth or Commonwealth, the material of which it is composed is strong and durable. What matters is the seams, and as the political threads weaken, as they inevitably must, it is all the more important to strengthen by every means in our power the other ties by which it is held together—the ties of sentiment and freedom and understanding. There are many people who, looking at the Commonwealth from outside, say that it is breaking up. And the odd thing is that it always looks as if it is.

In that sense it is one of the most baffling organizations that has ever existed. But, in fact, what is happening is that it is being reshaped and remoulded so as to bring it into line with a changing world. Therein lies its strength and its capacity for endurance. There are others who say that all empires have blossomed and then faded until they have collapsed and fallen in ruins. They say that that is bound to happen to our Commonwealth. But ours is different from all the empires of the past in that the bonds which unite it are not subject to any strain. They are flexible. New threads are constantly being added to the seams and old ones taken out so that the fabric as a whole remains intact. The seams, therefore, will not give and the thread will not snap, leaving a heap of rags and tatters.

Your country and mine are still great countries. Let us not be afraid to say so. Let us "Have no craven fear of being great". Let us have faith in our destiny for we must remember that the Commonwealth has many lessons to teach. All the problems which now face the world have been met at some time or other in the Commonwealth. Think what a lesson Canada can give to those who are trying to form a Western Union of European States. But the Commonwealth will not survive if we just "sit pretty" and do nothing about it. We must work for it and improve it, and renew it and maintain constant vigilance. I believe one way in which we can preserve it is by doing all we can to break down the barriers of prejudice and ignorance and misunderstanding by which peoples, as opposed to Governments, are so often through no fault of their own, separated.

To whatever extent the British Council can assist in that work, I believe it will be readily supported by people of goodwill, here as in many other countries.

The speaker was thanked by Mr. Charles R. Sanderson.

We have just listened to a very significant address. The magnificent work of the British Council has been far too little known in Canada and we are indebted to Sir Shuldham Redfern for his story of what it is doing.

The ties which bind Canada and Britain together today are our common heritage, our common fealty and loyalty, our common background. But two things should be added to that statement. Each can be said in a single sentence.

First: The background for tomorrow is being created today. Background must be kept alive, kept real, kept meaningful. That is what the British Council is doing. That is what Sir Shuldham has been doing today.

Secondly: The things he has been talking about are all "things of the mind." But just because they *are* things of the mind they need to be kept *in* mind. We need to be *re*-minded of them. And again that is what the British Council is doing. That is what Sir Shuldham has been doing for us today. We are grateful to him.

"ARE THE SCHOOLS PREPARING YOUTH TO TAKE OVER?"

An Address By

DR. CECIL C. GOLDRING, M.A., D.PAED.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, November 4th, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

The children of today will in a few short years be homemakers and parents of the next generation, and from among them will slowly emerge our future leaders. How good their leadership will be depends in no small part on their education and early training.

This week being Education Week, the spotlight in Toronto quite naturally rests on our Director of Education, Dr. C. C. Goldring, who with a teaching staff of 3,000 under his supervision, has the very heavy responsibility entrusted to him of educating and training 80,000 students so that they will start their careers with a sound fundamental education and full knowledge of their future responsibilities as good citizens of this far Dominion.

Dr. Goldring was born in Whitby, Ontario.

He is a graduate of Queen's University and holds the degrees of M.A. and Doctor of Pedagogy from the University of Toronto.

In 1912 he started teaching at Earl Grey School, Toronto, and in due time was appointed principal of Earl Beatty School.

In 1927 he was appointed Public School Inspector, Superintendent of School in 1932 and Director of Education in 1945.

Dr. Goldring is well known as a speaker and writer on educational topics. He is also actively identified with many important educational, civic and community organizations and we are proud to include him in the membership of The Empire Club.

Dr. Goldring has visited Great Britain and the United States on many occasions for the purpose of studying their educational methods.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Dr. Cecil C. Goldring, who has selected as his subject "Are the Schools Preparing Youth to Take Over."

Man is now living in a world in which vast social, economic and political upsets have taken place during recent years. Moral and spiritual values may seem to have gone down in the deluge. What people believed and have lived by, what parents have given to their children as guiding rules—much of this has been broken down and wiped out. What was once unquestioned and unquestionable is now being questioned and doubted. Out of this world of disorder and unrest people are seeking a new status. The present time of turmoil and conflict holds a promise as well as a threat. During the twentieth century to date man has advanced more in knowledge—especially scientific knowledge—than in any similar period of the world's history. During the twentieth century to date there has been more wilful destruction of human lives and property than in any similar period of history. Is it not clear then that the challenge of the time is for men to study and learn how to live together in goodwill so that human knowledge may be used for the welfare of man rather than for his destruction?

I am aware that this question is as old as recorded history. The oldest book in existence was written in Egypt about 2900 B.C.—approximately 4,850 years ago. It was entitled, "The Teaching of Ke'gemni", and it gives some realistic suggestions for daily life. The following is a sentence from it:

"If a man be lacking in good fellowship, no speech hath any influence over him. He is a sour face toward the glad-hearted that are kindly to him: he is a grief unto his mother and his friends."

There have been times, too, in which all has seemed lost, even to leaders in Britain.

1801, Wilberforce, who had much to do with the abolition of slavery, said:

"I dare not marry. The future is so unsettled."

In 1806, William Pitt said:

"There is scarcely anything around us but ruin and despair."

In 1848, Shaftesbury, who was responsible for improved factory laws and for improving the condition of the miners, said:

"Nothing can save the British Empire from shipwreck."

The next year, 1849, Disraeli said:

"In industry, commerce and agriculture, there is no hope."

In 1852, the Duke of Wellington, when near death, said:

"I thank God I shall be spared from seeing the consummation of ruin which is gathering about us."

Apparently the outlook was very dark in Britain about a hundred years ago.

It has remained for a British historian of the present time—namely, Arnold Toynbee—to remind us that nineteen of twenty civilizations have gone to their death through war or internal conflicts or some combination of the two. If we cannot learn to prevent war then not only is civilization fated to annihilation but the human species as well. To quote Toynbee from "Civilization on Trial" published in 1948: "But we are not doomed to make history repeat itself: it is open to us, through our own efforts, to give history, in our case, some new and unprecedented turn. As human beings, we are endowed with this freedom of choice, and we cannot shuffle off our responsibility upon the shoulders of God or nature. We must shoulder it ourselves. It is up to us."

If the present is a time of challenge and of hope, as well as a time of threatening and danger, education has a part to perform in helping to develop human beings of the sort mentioned by Toynbee.

EDUCATION IN ONTARIO AND THE BRITISH ISLES

In Ontario, a century ago, school-houses were putting in an appearance in the settlements which had been hewn from the forests. It was important for children to learn to read since many homes and communities were isolated, to write in order to communicate with friends, and to keep simple accounts, hence the traditional "three R's". It might be noted that someone with a critical mind recently stated that the modern "three R's" are Rallies, Recesses and Rumba. High Schools were established in the cities and towns to prepare a small number of young people for university and for admission to Normal Schools but most boys and girls did not progress beyond the elementary school and many did not complete the public school course. In time, elementary schools and academic High Schools were established to serve the needs of the children in most parts of southern Ontario. During the last twenty-five or thirty years there has been a growth in secondary schools of another type, namely, the vocational schools.

In order to survey the school system of this province and to recommend changes to meet the challenge of the new age, a Royal Commission was appointed by the Ontario Legislature in 1945. Its Chairman is Mr. Justice Hope, and in 1946, he and Dr. Althouse, the Chief Director of Education for the province of Ontario, went to the British Isles, Sweden and Denmark, to study developments in education. I had the privilege of accompanying them.

We found that vast educational changes are being brought about in England, Scotland and Ireland. Life is to be planned in a manner which has hitherto not been done. The authorities hope to abolish or lessen certain class distinctions by means of the schools. No boy or girl is to be debarred, by lack of means, from taking the course of education for which he or she is qualified. Bright children will be carefully selected and trained for future leadership. Two of the common expressions frequently heard were "equality of educational opportunity" and "parity of esteem for all secondary school pupils". One is impressed by the fact that careful methodical plans for gradual changes in education over a period of years are being made and put into effect. It is interesting to note in passing that the new Education Act was introduced by Mr. Churchill's government and accepted in toto by the Labour Government when it came into power so that it has very strong support. We found the educators in Britain eager to ask us questions about educational developments in Canada and anxious to share their knowledge with us.

This past summer, I spent several weeks in the British Isles again and I can report that steady progress is being made toward the realization of the educational goals set up a few years ago. Much of the uncertainty apparent in 1946 has disappeared and the visitor feels that the people of Britain are on their way toward definite objectives.

SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF CHILDREN

Not only in Britain, but in the English-speaking world generally there are indications that fundamental changes in points of view regarding education are taking place. These changes are the result of the scientific study of education during the past quarter century. Some of them stem from the knowledge of the individual differences of boys and girls, which came to the fore in the 1920's. The Intelligence Tests administered to the American army during the First World War indicated that people differ considerably in native ability and the use of standard tests of various kinds in schools during the past 25 to 30 years has supplied additional proof of the same fact. This knowledge of the wide differences in children has led to the establishment of special classes for children of different types. We see its effect too in school administration, in school buildings, in school libraries, on the playgrounds, in teaching procedures, as well as in the different types of schools. The fundamental purpose now is to provide equal educational opportunity for all boys and girls to develop fruitfully along the lines of their respective abilities.

A few other principles affecting educational practice today will be referred to briefly:

(1) Behaviour is learned. What we do when we are young has a great influence in determining the sort of persons we will be when we become older. Patterns of growth and behaviour are established early in life, and these patterns are built into the personality of the maturing child. Accordingly, emphasis is placed to-day upon the education of young children and we have a demand for the establishment of kindergartens and various forms of pre-school education.

(2) Learning and growth are stimulated by both security and adventure. On the one hand a reasonable sense of security is necessary for learning. Overwhelming difficulties are apt to cause frustration. On the other hand, a high degree of over-protection prolongs dependence, retards emotional development and discourages exploratory learning. The desire of some parents to protect their child from all anxiety, to hold him in the vice of parental care, to over-possess him, is a common way of frustrating growth and paralysing normal aggressive action in the early years, only to see it break out later in a desperate and perhaps neurotic effort to cut the tie that binds parents and child together. I am not suggesting that there is no need for parental guidance of children. In fact, I believe that the average child should have considerable guidance and direction from his parents. The point is, however, that it should not be of such a kind that the child is deprived of the opportunity and experience of making some decisions by himself. The need is to pro-

vide experiences which challenge the learner progressively to behaviour of a more mature and responsible sort.

(3) We learn what we live. Learning is organized into the nervous system in the form of memory, habits and attitudes, and thus becomes part of our living. How important it is then to provide a good environment for children!

(4) We learn a great deal by example and learn it rather permanently. This is the argument for teachers of high personal worth. Unless we have teachers of the right sort, the money we spend in providing good buildings and buying equipment may not bring about good educational results. The teacher day by day teaches himself, and what he stands for, by means of his personal example. Many boys and girls in school have the opportunity and need to look up to and copy the subtle personality of a really fine gentleman or lady who is a teacher on the staff. Whatever we wish to see in our children, we must be sure exists in the teachers of our children.

(5) During recent years there has been a tendency to introduce into the schools the teachings of mental health. Psychiatrists are anxious to share their knowledge with those who deal with people. They admit that in the wilderness of the mind there is more unexplored than explored. One of the important questions of the psychiatrists at present is, "Can man's increasing knowledge of his own behaviour save him from destruction?"

Considering the level of the school, the problem is to translate some of the teachings of mental health into action. Children have need of love, reasonable security, and understanding. Hence parents should try to provide a good home life and have a greater knowledge than some possess of the fundamental needs of children. Stable affection is a necessary condition for children's development and growth and the mental hygiene people emphasize the need for pre-school education; education of parents and young adults for family life, a knowledge by parents of their responsibility toward their children, and a careful selection of teachers from the point of view of their emotional development and attitude to and understanding of children. They believe, too, in instructing children in such a way that they will become good world citizens. The best world citizen is defined as being he who obeys the Biblical injunction, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself".

(6) Among the school subjects, Reading is now given a very important place. Obviously, one can not make much progress in school in most subjects unless he can read. Scientists have been investigating lack of reading ability during recent years and have concluded that the ability to read has not a close relationship to intelligence, that many intelligent people are not able to read tolerably well, and that lack of reading ability lies at the root of many cases of psychological maladjustments that trouble present day society. For example, let us think of an earnest, hard working, intelligent man who finds that there is one essential aspect of his business which he cannot learn to understand or carry out successfully. He notices that other young men, apparently no brighter than he, have little difficulty in mastering this part of his work. If he finds himself in this position of frustration year after year, he becomes unhappy and in time he may have serious doubts about his general ability in other aspects of life. Many children in school are in the position of this hypothetical man because they cannot learn to read so well as their fellow pupils of similar age and year after year they are handicapped, not only in the one subject, but in most others as well. The Toronto Board of Education has recently established a Reading Clinic to diagnose reading disa-

bilities and to prescribe remedial measures. In all our schools—public and secondary—we are emphasizing the importance of normal reading ability.

Secondary Schools

A recent trend in secondary school education is that of providing a better type of education for the girls and boys who leave school at approximately the age of sixteen. It is estimated that, in a typical city, about 20 per cent. of adolescent girls and boys can profitably take a thorough-going academic course; that another 20 per cent. can profit from a thorough-going vocational course; this leaves about 60 per cent. who do not want either of the courses mentioned, but for one reason or another leave school at about the sixteenth birthday and get a job. This group is not composed of misfits, of delinquents, of those who possess low intelligence quotients, nor is it characterized by a low economic status. It is made up of a cross section of youth who will not go to university and who have not as yet chosen an occupation for which they want specific vocational training.

Under present conditions a student at the age of sixteen probably would have completed about two years of a four or five-year course, and he leaves school with a sense of incompleteness. Such students are not good advertisements of our school system. In the United States this group is sometimes referred to as "The Neglected 60%", and courses, sometimes called "Life Adjustment Courses", are being set up to meet their needs. A few years ago, the Educational Policies Commission of the United States set down ten imperative educational needs of all youth, and without reading them in detail, I might say that they refer to such needs as the following:

To prepare for work,
To be good citizens,
To enjoy leisure time,
To maintain health,
To participate in community activities,
To participate in successful family life,

To think rationally, and to express their thoughts clearly,

To know how to purchase and use goods and services intelligently.

The Life Adjustment Courses are built upon these ten needs of youth and it is intended to devise the courses so that they will have real use value for the student's future occupation or in his life; and he is taught to recognize these values and carry them with him when he leaves school.

The Status of the Teaching Profession in Canada

I have indicated something of the varied abilities and of the high standard we wish on the part of our teachers to attain some of the objectives mentioned. What are the facts about the teaching profession in Canada at present? Recently, under the auspices of the Canadian Education Association, a survey was completed dealing with this topic, and it will be published in the course of the next few months. I shall mention a few of the facts contained in it. I might say that a total of 4,920 questionnaires were distributed to secure the information, and approximately 3,000 of them were completed and returned. Here are some of the facts revealed by the 3,000 answers.

(a) *Length of time in the profession*:

635 students-in-training revealed that
7% intended to stay less than 2 years,
36% less than 5 years,
30% permanently,
23% gave the answer "I do not know".

Of 66,000 persons entering the teaching profession in the last ten years, only 26,500 (40%) are in the service to-day.

(b) The *basic preparation* of 56,897 Canadian teachers for which data are available is as follows:

15% are university graduates,
49% have Senior Matriculation standing,
35% are graduates of Grade XI only.

Regarding training, 78% have received between 6 and 12 months of training; 15% have had less than 6 months of professional training, and 7% have had more than 12 months.

(c) In 1946 the following were the facts regarding the *salaries of* Canadian teachers:

Approx. 15% rec'd less than $1,000 per annum,
Approx. 42% rec'd less than $1,225 per annum,
Approx. 65% rec'd less than $1,525 per annum,
Only 6% rec'd approx. $3,000 or more.

The median salary of all teachers in Canada at that time was $1,306.00.

In 1946-7 the average Canadian wage level was about 70% above the 1939 level; for teachers the corresponding figure was 38%.

(d) In some parts of Canada there are *complaints* of the following sort regarding teachers:

a. There are prohibitions against such recreations as card playing and dancing;
b. Regular church attendance and Sunday School teaching are obligatory;
c. The teacher is required to devote a disproportionate amount of his out-of-school time to community service;
d. Living quarters selected by the teacher must meet with the approval of the school board;
e. The teacher is not free to select companions of his choice.

(e) The *average length of experience* of Canada's teachers is too short.

Approx. 33% have less than 5 years' service;
Approx. 51% have less than 10 years' service;
Approx. 65% have less than 15 years' service;
Only 23% have more than 20 years' service.

General Picture

The length of service is relatively short; many teachers do not intend to stay long in the profession. Their basic education is that of a high school course, plus some further training. Typical salary is about $150 a month for ten months. There are local restrictions in many places, interfering with normal freedom of conduct.

Is the public satisfied with conditions such as have been revealed? Should we expect the sort of leadership we require from teachers who live and work under the conditions described? It is suggested that we need higher requirements for entrance to the teaching profession, better selection of prospective teachers, a longer period of training—in England it is a two-year course and in some parts of the United States the period of training is four years. To bring about these conditions, higher salaries are needed, more adequate pensions, and good living and working conditions.

Citizenship

There is another and very important aspect of education to which I must refer briefly. We like to think of education as an investment in democracy. We like to tell the young that youth has a social heritage to be made his own and a latent power of reflective thought to be developed, and that these two constitute the chief objectives in education. It has been said that the final test of education is the union of knowledge and reason in the integrated personality. But do such statements include all the fundamental purposes of education? Should we not consider the use to which this training will be put? Are our schools to be but the social elevators in a hardening social structure? Youth must not regard education as a sharp and powerful tool to use to crack the bank of opportunity. For some people school education may be nothing more than a sharpening of beak and claw and an arming with deadlier weapons.

It has been said that the test of life is "How much do you care?" Life involves sensitivity to the wants and needs of others. Somehow there must be incorporated into school curricula a basic core of moral experience which will set up codes which will encourage the young to act with moral understanding of themselves and others and make them feel their responsibility to society.

This task is not becoming easier with the increasing complexity of modern life with its specialization. Life for many seems to be fragmentary. At times we seem to be skating around the edge of the real core of life, which, in terms of education, should include some reference to the development of will power, the wise exercise of choice, an appreciation of right and wrong with determination to choose that which seems right, and a recognition of the eternal verities. We need to give increased emphasis to a quality to which the ancient Greeks attached a great deal of importance and which may best be expressed by the word *virtue*. Indeed, for a definition of education of the sort I am advocating, I go back to Plato and quote from his Laws, "Education is that schooling from boyhood in goodness which inspires the recipient with passionate and ardent desire to become a perfect citizen".

We need to touch the imagination of the young to-day so that they will realize the value of a quality in living which is sometimes lost and which may be called *zest*. Can the young be influenced so that they will have a zest for striving to become perfect citizens? Can we channel the enthusiasm and zest of youth toward goodness, toward virtue, so that youth will be inspired (in the words of Plato) "with passionate and ardent desire to become a perfect citizen"? If each of us, as he may have opportunity, will encourage youth toward the end suggested, he will by such action participate in a small way in building Canadian citizenship, and have a share in developing the sort of young people to whom can be safely entrusted the future of our country.

"MAPLE LEAF UP OR MAPLE LEAF DOWN"

AN ADDRESS BY

MAJOR GENERAL D. C. SPRY, C.B.E., D.S.O.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, November 11th, 1948

HONOURED GUESTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It hardly seems possible that three decades have passed since the First World War was brought to a victorious conclusion and that today is the thirtieth anniversary of Armistice Day. Since then a Second World War has intervened, which is responsible for November 11th now being observed as Remembrance Day, the one day in the year when all good Canadians pause from their daily tasks to render silent homage to those who paid the supreme sacrifice that we and our children might continue to live and enjoy our freedom.

It therefore seemed most appropriate that on Remembrance Day our guest speaker should be a man with an outstanding record of service to Canada in the last war.

Our guest of honour today is Major-General D. C. Spry who served with great distinction in the last war and was promoted to the rank of Major-General at the age of 31, at which time he was the youngest officer in the British Commonwealth to attain that high rank.

In 1946 he was appointed Vice-Chief of the General Staff, a position he relinquished to become Chief Executive Commissioner of the Scout Movement in Canada.

Major-General Spry was born in Winnipeg and incidentally he is the son of a Major-General; he was educated in England and Canada and is a graduate of Dalhousie University.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Major-General D. C. Spry, C.B.E., D.S.O., who has chosen as his subject "Maple Leaf Up or Maple Leaf Down."

Maple Leaf Route was the main axis route of First Canadian Army. I don't suppose there is a soldier in the Canadian Army Overseas who did not see those famous signs—so well placed—so helpful—one felt at home. The "Up" Route led to the forward areas—to battle and to victory—up this route moved Canada's contribution to victory in Europe. Canada's present position in the world today requires decision as to the Route towards Peace—will it be *Maple Leaf Up*—or *Maple Leaf Down*?

On this 11th November we cannot fail to think upon those bloody days and nights through which Canadians fought in two world wars. Usually the unpleasant incidents fade into the misty edges of our memory leaving clearly focussed in the centre only those amusing, gay, happy moments which old soldiers recall with embellishments at reunions. It was well said that a "soldier's life is one of long periods of boredom punctuated by moments of intense fright". But today I can only think of some of the occasions that are fast fading into the mists—

Donald Woodruff caught one such moment in his poem—"Night Attack"—

The Dark Angel and I met
    as the long hand was vertical.
The barrage moved up with little
    mincing steps and we followed.
We crept forward through the
    Italian mud on our foreign bellies.
The flares made low constellations.
Then the Dark Angel touched the
    grenades at my belt, saying,
"Send these after me—I will be
    up ahead."
I did as he bade.
We took the emplacement together:

And the officers and men whose citations end with "This action was in the highest tradition of the Canadian Army"—do they not think of their pals—dead and living spread across ten countries of the world?

Yes—this is a day to think on.

Let us therefore think upon the theme "Maple Leaf Up—Maple Leaf Down". We have fought two parts of one war—must we have a third? What part can Canada play in the decision?

Canada came of age during the first war, but gained maturity and the respect of other nations during the last war. We now have an active voice in world affairs—in U.N.—in its agencies—in the Empire and Commonwealth—and in North America.

We have *made* an audience for ourselves by our phenomenal contribution to World War II. Our interests—selfish and altruistic—reach round the world. People listen with respect when Canada's representatives speak in the conference of nations—with respect not only for the able diplomats themselves—but respect for the potential and real power for good which Canada wields.

Mr. Churchill has said that Canada is the "linch-pin" of the English-speaking world. When history is written it will show we have played our part well since 1939. We can be and are acting as the "linch-pin".

But now we find ourselves in a position where we must do more than talk peace-time co-operation. We are discussing an Atlantic Pact which we are told will mean that U.S., Canada, and U.K. will guarantee the freedom from aggression of the Western European democracies. North America—the New World—to guarantee the safety of the old world from possible Communist assault!

The idea is intriguing—but what does it mean? It means that those countries who join in the Entente will accept the D'Artagnon principle of "one for all and all for one". Surely this must make sense—is it not better to strengthen and support one another in the face of a threat? History and the recent experience of two World

Wars has made an impression on Canadian thinking. This is apparently the wish of the Canadian people—there has been practically no opposing comment on recent reports. We have come to realize that in world affairs "when a rat teases a cat—you can count on it—he is leaning against a hole".

Canada's strategic position in the land and sea masses of the world, her traditional ties with the Commonwealth, Europe and America—all make the possibility of a defensive neutrality in a future war extremely hazardous. Therefore, we seem to have brought ourselves to the logical solution of collective security—in the face of ever-increasing failures to bring understanding and co-operation out of the tedious and numerous discussions with "the Bear behind the ice cap".

What does participation in such a pact mean in terms of policy? It means a history-making event for Canada—we are apparently prepared to commit ourselves for the first time to a definite peace-time defensive alliance. In terms of defence policy one must also ask where the forces and material are to come from? Are we to build something more than our meagre forces now available? If so—how? Are we to recommence in a large way the manufacture of war materials? Are we prepared to pay the price in money and men? Will we not be bound to do so as part of such a pact or alliance? In other words, have we not now reached the stage in our international experience where we must "put up or shut up"?

Here we find ourselves again at Maple Leaf up—or Maple Leaf Down. If we are really prepared to play our full share in the maintenance of peace, order and stability in the world then we are on the route "Maple Leaf Up"—if not—we are on "Maple Leaf Down", and we should not expect to have too much to say in the decisions of the next few years concerning the pace and direction in which the affairs of the world may move. If we take this route we must be prepared to follow events instead of helping to shape them.

Canon Scott saw something of what the present situation holds for us as individuals and as a nation.

THE UNBROKEN LINE

"Let us not lose the exalted love which came
From comradeship with danger and the joy
Of strong souls kindled into living flame
By one supreme desire, one high employ.
Let us draw closer in these narrow years,
Before us still the eternal visions spread.
We, who outmastered death and all its fears,
Are one great army still—living and dead."

For the sake of those we remember this 11th of November--for the sake of those who came back to search for peace—and for the sake of young Canadians of the future—let us choose with care and wisdom whether our route is

MAPLE LEAF UP—OR MAPLE LEAF DOWN.

"THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY IN CANADA AND THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF JET ENGINES"

An Address By

WALTER N. DEISHER

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse.

Thursday, November 18th, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

While nobody in his right mind would ever suggest that war was a good thing, nevertheless, under the stimulus of war some astounding progress has been made in the realm of science. For example, the combined efforts of many great scientists has finally cracked the atom, the peacetime potentialities of which are simply fantastic.

At the outbreak of the first World War the airoplane was a very flimsy affair. Much progress was made during the war but after peace came the tempo of developments in aeronautics became very slow until another war threatened and finally materialized 21 years later. Since then the progress in aviation has been simply astounding.

Today our guest speaker Mr. Walter N. Deisher, Vice-President and General Manager of A. V. Roe Co. who has been associated with the aircraft industry for over 39 years is going to tell us some of the developments we may anticipate in the aircraft industry in the not too distant future, but you can rest assured he will not divulge any official secrets.

Mr. Deisher is the proud possessor of a full-fledged pilot's license which he secured as far back as 1912, signed by Orville Wright.

He purchased his first aeroplane in 1919 and leased a section of land outside Ottawa which was cleared for a landing field and has since became Ottawa's official airport where thousands of pilots were trained during the last war.

During the past year Mr. Deisher was interested in a Company at Fort Erie, Ontario, where over three thousand trainer aircraft were produced.

In 1945 he accepted the heavy burden of responsibility of ushering in a great new programme for the A. V. Roe Co., which is gradually unfolding at Malton. It includes a jet engine, a jet fighter and a jet-powered transport.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Walter N. Deisher, whose subject will be "The Aircraft Industry in Canada and the Future Development of Jet Engines."

Gentlemen:

It has been my privilege to have been connected with the Canadian aircraft industry for more years than I care to count, and as a member of this group I consider it an honour to have the opportunity of speaking to you on the development and future of Canada's growing aircraft industry.

Most of us still remember the great achievement of the Canadian aviation industry between 1939 and 1945, during which time Canada—a nation with a land area of approximately three and one half million miles and a population of twelve million people—produced more aircraft per capita than any of our allied nations. I quote this statement from a recent issue of a leading American magazine. We are apt to forget, however, our own Canadian aeronautical pioneers, both civil and military, who quietly and methodically carried the burden of the industry through the formative years. To those who were outside the field of Canadian aviation prior to 1939 this remarkable growth may have appeared to develop overnight, but this was not so; commercial, civil and military aviation had been preparing itself for this tremendous effort.

As a prelude to later remarks in this address, I will deal briefly with the history of Canadian aviation. During the past three years a great deal of material has appeared in the papers about jet planes and jet engines. Nevertheless, to properly appreciate the present position of the Canadian aircraft industry, I would like to trace for you some of the highlights of the early years before telling you about the planes and engines of tomorrow.

Many of you may not realize that the first heavier-than-air flight in the British Empire was made in Canada. This flight was carried out in 1909 by J. A. D. McCurdy in his "Silver Dart" at Baddeck, Nova Scotia.

Aviation was given a great impetus through World War I, but these aircraft were not particularly reliable, and after the war commercial operation was restricted to a handful of enthusiasts who were interested in flying for flying's sake.

It was not until the late 'twenties that the country began awakening to the commercial possibilities in aviation. Several aviation companies were formed, the Government began carrying mail on an experimental basis, and the organization of flying clubs commenced. The exploits of individuals, such as the flight of Kingsford Smith and his associates from California to Australia, and the flight to Paris by Lindbergh in 1927, stirred the imagination of the public, and occupied much space in our newspapers.

These exciting flights were considered foolhardy, however, by the public, who little realized that in a short twenty years many of them would be taking the same flights themselves, and considering them quite commonplace.

In the early 'thirties the Canadian Government decided to release funds to assist civil aviation, and the carrying of airmail was turned over to commercial companies. In addition, a number of smaller companies entered the field. Competition became very keen, in fact too keen, and when the cold breath of the depression hit, very few were able to show a profit. The more enterprising ones turned to bush flying, that is the carrying of men and materials into the North Country where land transportation was difficult and slow. For several years commercial flying was largely confined to the bush, a phase of operation in which Canada led the world.

The Government, meanwhile, had recognized the need of setting up air bases from coast to coast, and was busy during the 'thirties building a series of suitable airports from British Columbia to the Maritimes. Canada was indeed becoming air-minded, and in 1936 civil aviation was divorced from military aviation, and placed under the Department of Transport.

With the completion of the first phase of construction of the transcontinental bases, the stage was set, and the next year in 1937, Trans-Canada Airlines was formed. By the end of the year this young airline had a fleet of five aircraft, each carrying ten passengers. The history of this government-owned company has been one of steady expansion, and we are indeed proud to say that its standard of service ranks high among the airlines of the world. A number of other airlines, chief of which is Canadian Pacific Airlines, have also grown up with T.C.A. While a number of smaller companies were engaged in the manufacture of aircraft during the 'thirties, production orders were never large, but most of the companies were able to maintain their small staffs.

Following the outbreak of war in 1939, the Department of Munitions and Supply was formed, and the Canadian aircraft industry commenced its phenomenal growth. At the peak of production in 1944 there were over *120,000* persons employed in the production of aircraft and associated equipment, and by the time activities ceased, Canada had built more than 16,000 aircraft, and had overhauled and repaired approximately 6,000 more.

When the war ended the inevitable happened, and the manufacture of aircraft dropped to a very low figure, but the stimulus given to it during the war years was not entirely lost.

. . . .

Let us examine the industry as it stands today.

One of the oldest firms in Canada is The DeHavilland

Aircraft Company of Canada Limited, just north of Toronto at Downsview. This plant, since the war, has designed and built two entirely new types of aircraft; the first, a two-seater, all-metal trainer called the "Chipmunk". This trainer has already been selected for use in the Royal Air Force and it is anticipated that foreign countries will be ordering them. The second aircraft, the "Beaver", is also of Canadian design and has been built primarily for bush flying operations, and the forestry services have already ordered a quantity of them. The "Beaver" is a five passenger, single engined monoplane with a very satisfactory performance. The company is also assembling British built "Vampire" jet fighters for the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Canadair in Montreal is producing the well-known *"North Star"* airliner, a number of which are already in use by T.C.A. on trans-ocean and domestic routes. They have recently received an order for an additional quantity of these aircraft from British Overseas Airways Corporation, and anticipate orders from foreign countries. This particular aircraft is the basic Douglas DC-4 and DC-6 with the design modified by the Canadian company to take Rolls-Royce Merlin power plants. A number of other refinements have also been added. Canadair is also designing a freighter version of this machine, which would prove to be an extremely useful aircraft.

The third of the three large aircraft plants in Canada is our own company, Avro Canada at Malton.

Primarily because we are doing a considerable amount of new development work, work which has never before been carried on in Canada, I should like to give you a fairly complete picture of this work. Some of the projects are of a secret nature, however, and detailed information on these cannot be revealed at this time.

Our first project is the design and development of a high performance, long range, jet powered fighter. Performance and information on this aircraft is, of course, secret but we anticipate that it will embody design features making it equal in performance to any aircraft of its type in the world. It is the first front-line fighter aircraft which has been designed by Canadians.

Our second project is the design and development of a commercial type jet powered airliner. The original plans for this airliner were laid down in 1946, at a time when other companies showed little enthusiasm for the jet transport, and argued that due to the high fuel consumption the pure jet transport would not be an economical proposition. In fact there was also a certain amount of skepticism that Canada, who had never produced a Canadian designed transport, could produce such an advanced and completely new type of aeroplane. Despite this criticism we decided to continue with the design and manufacture of our transport. The opinion that the jet-powered airliner would be uneconomical continued until as recently as six to eight months ago. But it is significant to note that most of the companies, who were loudly proclaiming the disadvantages of such an aircraft have now turned through 180 degrees and reversed their policy completely. They are now convinced that the pure jet transport can not only be favourably compared with the latest conventional reciprocating and propjet types, but actually make them look almost obsolete. Several of them have quietly begun the design of jet-powered transports of their own.

Let me tell you a little more about this aircraft. It has been designed basically as a short to medium range transport for Canadian domestic routes, a fact which should make it adaptable to most domestic routes throughout the world.

For optimum conditions, we have designed the cabin to carry from 36 to 40 passengers, together with a crew of three—the captain, first officer, and stewardess. The fuselage is fully air-conditioned for maximum comfort, and is pressurized so that when you are travelling at 30,000 ft., the equivalent pressure in the cabin is only 4,000 ft. altitude. You must appreciate that for greatest economy the jet-powered aircraft must fly at high altitudes, and by maintaining almost sea level conditions in the cabin we can climb or descend from altitude at a comparatively rapid rate, an important consideration on short ranges. From a safety point of view there will be complete duplication of all essential services throughout the aircraft.

The aircraft will contain a number of other features such as, integral fuel tanks; that is, the outer wing portion between the spars will act as the fuel tanks; electro-thermal leading edge de-icing by means of electrical heaters embedded in rubber; and flush radio antennae to reduce drag.

The aircraft will be powered with four turbojet Rolls-Royce Derwent engines. We have selected the Derwent engine as it represents the most reliable jet engine being manufactured today with a higher number of flying hours than any other jet engine. Since there are no propellers, the aircraft sits fairly low on the ground, and maintenance is a much easier proposition. In fact, with our design of engine nacelles we anticipate being able to change a complete engine in approximately a half an hour.

We are presently carrying out a considerable number of tests on structure to insure that all design figures are checked, and I think I can predict, with fair confidence, that in the Avro Jet Airliner Canada has designed an aircraft capable of meeting world wide competition.

When it is your turn to experience your first flight in our jet airliner, and that day is approaching swiftly, I would like you to remember what I am about to say on its flight characteristics, relating to passenger comfort. It will be so quiet in the pressurized and air-conditioned cabin that you will be able to converse in whispers; you will be pleasantly surprised at the lack of vibration; and it will feel like sifting through space. You will experience a new sense of comfort, safety and relaxation in air travel, and I would like to further prophesy that you'll probably turn to your fellow passenger and, "Why hasn't this been available before?"

In addition to the comfort afforded by vibrationless flight, it will also have a beneficial effect on the maintenance and life of the aircraft. The airframe will last very much longer and the increased life and safety eventually reduce the cost of air travel, providing, of course, other costs remain constant.

Designed as it is for high altitude travel you will be flying above the bad weather most of the time.

The first of our jet airliners will be flying sometime early next year. That does not mean that it will be ready for public flight. We shall have to carry out many months of test flights, under all types of conditions, to insure that all the "bugs" are out of it. By 1951, however, these airliners should be on some of the Canadian routes, and your future flights to Montreal will be a comfortable one hour's trip.

Several people have asked me whether jet engines use more fuel than conventional piston engines. The answer is yes . . . under certain conditions, and those conditions are low attitudes and low speeds. As the speed and altitude of an aircraft increases, the efficiency of the piston engine drops rapidly, but with a jet engine the power of the engine simply increases the faster the airplane flies, and its fuel consumption improves. Because of turbine blade cooling and a number of other technological advances the fuel consumption of the jet already approximates that of the reciprocating engine under some comparable conditions, and in its own high-altitude, high-speed sphere is surprisingly less.

In view of these factors, which are becoming more evident today, I feel that the decision which we made several years ago to proceed with the jet transport was not an unwise one.

The third major project which we have under development at Malton is our jet engine, but before dealing with the jet engine I would like to complete the aircraft picture.

. . . .

What about the future of the aircraft industry in Canada?

There will undoubtedly be a market, though a small one, for the personal plane, that is the one, two and four seater types. The manufacture of these types will not, however, be carried on in any quantity in this country *for some years*, at least not until *all-weather* flying aids for light planes have been introduced, and are in common use, and not until a network of *suitable airfield facilities* at the smaller towns have been built up. There is a steady growth in the number of light planes in use in this country, but the majority of these are of American manufacture. Later, I believe, we shall see these aircraft built in Canada, but probably of American design.

In the larger type civil aircraft and in the military field, I can safely say that we are approaching the *jet age when practically all aircraft in the high-power, high-duty class will be jet powered.* The inherent simplicity of the jet with its freedom from vibration, absence of propellers, and reduction in the number of instruments in the cockpit all lead to an aeroplane simpler to operate and simpler to maintain.

We at Avro Canada are fully aware of the part the jet will play in the future of air travel, and a design and development organization is being built up with the engineering knowledge of the world famous Hawker Siddeley Group at our command, which should keep our country right up in front with the rest of the aviation world.

While the industry as a whole is small, its size belies its importance. The aeroplane has made Canada a much smaller country, and has opened up the North to a great extent, and will continue to do so to an ever increasing degree. Not only has it proven itself useful in times of emergency, such as during the floods this spring in British Columbia when all rail traffic was cut off, but its worth in national defence is becoming more and more apparent every day.

Our northern frontiers are exposed, we might as well face that fact, and we as a nation are large enough that we must build up an air force capable of defending it. I do not think that I need emphasize this preparedness theme, but the aircraft industry is tied up intimately with our national defence plans. We must insure that the industry is maintained and kept in a state of readiness.

No large aircraft plant can carry out a development programme without some form of government assistance. The development of a new aircraft may run anywhere from *five to ten million dollars*. The U.S. industry, and the United States government has recognized this, and the larger companies are now being assisted by means of army, airforce, or navy contracts, and I believe *the Canadian government will insure* the same policies are carried out in this country.

. . . .

And now I should like to devote the balance of this talk to tell you something of the jet engine.

The aircraft engine industry is unique as an industry because it flourishes mainly as a result of national support. This differs from nationalization and should not be confused with it.

The main reason why national support is necessary for the existence of a healthy industry is a financial one caused by the high cost of developing engines. If the engine after development is successful, it results in relatively small orders in peacetime, but if the engine fails to be accepted, the financial results can be disastrous.

Another important reason for national support on engine development is that in the early prototype or production stages, most aircraft engines owe their existence to the military requirements of the country which built them, and rarely do these engines become useful for commercial operation until they have first seen some military service. The Merlin engines, in use on T.C.A.'s North Stars, went through a long operational training on Spitfires, Hurricanes, and Lancaster Bombers before being used on commercial aircraft.

Therefore, an entirely new type of engine will first meet military requirements, and then have several years of military service to insure a satisfactory degree of reliability before considering it for airline use.

Previous to World War II, several small scale attempts had been made in Canada to build aircraft engines, but these resulted in failure, mainly because of lack of national support.

During the early years of the recent war, as I previously mentioned, our aircraft industry undertook a tremendous programme of expansion. This was required to meet ever increasing demands for both training and operational type aircraft. We were relying, however, on both the United Kingdom and the United States to supply the necessary power plants. *This worked out fairly well until the Germans commenced bombing British engine plants,* and the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbour. In the space of *a few months the supply of engines became critical,* and the whole industry was placed in an extremely precarious position. While we did survive the crisis, it served as a lesson in the need for independence, and created the impetus for subsequent developments.

Some thought was given during this period to setting up a Canadian aircraft engine plant, but it was not considered a good time for it. Such a decision would have diverted much needed machinery from where it could be put to more immediate and effective use. Furthermore, it appeared that the setting up of a design and development organization would be slow and difficult and would probably not bear fruit in time to be of use in the war effort.

In 1942 the Canadian Government received word of a development in the U.K. of a new type of aircraft engine of great promise. Anxious to assist in the event of Britain's plants being bombed out, and desirous of entering the aircraft engine field to make Canadian industry more independent, our Government sent men to Britain to study the new power units.

As a result a cold weather test station was set up in this country to test British jets under severe weather conditions and later a Crown-owned company, Turbo Research Limited, was established to recruit and train young engineers in the new field of jet propulsion.

At the end of the War, the Government decided to transfer the task of engine design and development to private industry. It was at this point our own company, Avro Canada, realizing the importance of the jet engine in our aircraft programme, took over Turbo Research, and in the spring of 1946 transferred staff and facilities to Malton.

Since then we have created and trained a manufacturing organization in this new skill and established facilities for progressive development work in the new field.

These facilities are capable of designing and manufacturing new types of aircraft engines for both military and civil needs to meet conditions peculiar to this country. In doing this we have not only taken definite steps to make the Canadian aircraft industry more independent, but we have offered to Canadian engineers, for the first time, a full scope in the aircraft engine field hitherto available only in other countries.

The first jet engine designed by our Gas Turbine Division was completed and ran in March of this year. We are fortunate indeed in having a young and enthusiastic design team. These men have had the opportunity of studying all the good and bad points of most of the jet engines built by the best British builders, and as a result our first jet engine was designed to eliminate, as much as possible, the troubles which were encountered on previous engines. Our first engine, the "Chinook" is a development engine and is now being used to supply us with the answers for designing and building more powerful engines. These larger engines are already on the design board and under manufacture.

It is not difficult to *pretend* to do some crystal gazing and forecast what the jet engine industry in Canada is going to be, but I think it would be well to remember that *the jet engine is still in its infancy*, and I should like to be conservative in my estimates.

Its low power-to-weight ratio, its compactness, ease of maintenance, and its greater aptitude for high altitude, high speed work, makes it the favoured engine for future aircraft.

Our engineers at Malton are betting on it, and I frankly do not think that they will be disappointed. We hope that we, as the first aircraft engine industry in Canada will be able to bring out a product capable of boosting our national pride.

I would again like to thank you for the opportunity of presenting this talk to members and guests of the Empire Club of Canada.

"THE OUTLOOK TODAY"

AN ADDRESS BY

SIR ALEXANDER CLUTTERBUCK, K.C.M.G., M.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse.

Thursday, November 25th, 1948.

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

Keeping in mind that this is The Empire Club of Canada and that our motto is "Canada and a United Empire," it is but natural that we should endeavour to arrange for as many speakers as possible from the heart of the Empire. Today it is my privilege and pleasure to introduce Sir Alexander Clutterbuck, High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada.

Sir Alexander was educated at Malvern College and Pembroke College, Cambridge. He served with the Coldstream Guards in the First World War, was awarded the Military Cross and mentioned in despatches.

He then entered the Civil Service and served in the Colonial Office from 1922 to 1928, during which time he visited Ceylon.

Sir Alexander then moved to the Dominions Office and was a member of the United Kingdom Delegation to League of Nations Assembly, 1929, 1930 and 1931. He was Secretary to the Newfoundland Royal Commission and visited Canada and Newfoundland in 1933. He paid a further visit to Newfoundland in 1938.

In 1939 Sir Alexander was appointed Deputy High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in the Union of South Africa.

In 1942 he was appointed Assistant Under-Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, when he again visited Canada and Newfoundland, with the then Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Atlee.

In 1946 he was appointed High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada, in succession to the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald.

Incidentally, when I was talking to His Excellency, the Governor-General last Tuesday, he said "Clutterbuck is a very fine speaker. I am sorry I cannot hear him." I thought Sir Alexander might like to hear that he was held in such high esteem by His Excellency.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Sir Alexander Clutterbuck, K.C.M.G., M.C., whose subject will be "THE OUTLOOK TO-DAY."

Mr. President and Gentlemen: It is a very great privilege for me to have the opportunity of addressing you today and I thank you most warmly for your kind invitation and for the very friendly reception you have given me. I well know what fine work this Club is doing in focussing attention on current problems, both in the Commonwealth and outside, and helping in that way to build up that informed public opinion without which our democratic system cannot function to its fullest effect.

We live in times when history is in the making. History is being made before our eyes and far-reaching changes are taking place all over the world. Here in Canada during this month history has been made, for a great Prime Minister has laid down his burden after carrying it for longer than any of his predecessors. Now, history itself will record the achievements of Mr. Mackenzie King, and it would be presumptuous indeed for me to attempt to assess them. I will only say this, that the entire Commonwealth joins in salute to one of the great figures of our time. What a great satisfaction it must be to him in his retirement to be able to look back and reflect on the tremendous strides which this country has made in prosperity, expansion and international stature since the day when he first took office.

And now Mr. St. Laurent assumes the burden. No one who has come into contact with him can have failed to be impressed by his great qualities of heart and mind and Canada is indeed fortunate in having such a man at this juncture to assume the direction of her affairs. We in Britain join with you in Canada here in wishing him every succcess in his high task.

When we look out on the world today we seem to see nothing but troubles and difficulties, and I think we are in slight danger of becoming so obsessed by these difficulties that we fail to observe the progress that has been made since the war. Above all, we must not get into the position of failing to see the wood for the trees and so today, with your permission, I should like to give you just a short bird's eye view of the situation as we in Britain see it, concentrating chiefly on the economic side of things which to my mind is the most important, because I am convinced that without improvement in economic conditions you will not get political stability.

In order to get the correct perspective I must ask you to come back with me for a few minutes to 1946, two years ago, when we all thought that the world was making a fair start toward recovery. We realized that from the economic standpoint the most formidable of all problems was confronting us, namely, the righting of the great unbalance which had been left in the world by the war. On the one hand, there was the great productive machines in Europe, built up over the centuries, but shattered and dislocated out of all recognition, and having to be slowly and painfully rebuilt, inch by inch, as it were, against great odds in a world of shortages and often, too often, against a background of acute political unrest.

On the other hand, there was the great productive machine in North America which—and thank Heaven for it, for it is rescuing Europe today—emerged unscathed from the physical damage of the war and was indeed vastly expanded under the impetus of war necessities.

Now, to right that unbalance was a big job. It had to be done as quickly as possible because it was obvious to all that the economy of the world simply would not work until it was done and until trade could flow again in normal and not artificial channels. We thought that could be done, working together, in about three years, and we set out in 1946 with high hopes. 1946 was a good year —it seemed that those hopes were justified. But as we all know, they were doomed to frustration, largely through a series of adverse factors beyond our control. I need not go into these here, except to mention the most important and that was that we had thought, perhaps innocently, but I think justifiably, that we could count after the war on the same degree of co-operation among the great powers of the world in rebuilding the peace as we had secured in carrying the war through to final victory.

Now, we all know that that co-operation has been denied to us, and continues to be denied to us, in one most important quarter and the result of that has been to retard seriously economic recovery over large parts of Europe.

In 1947 we had shock after shock and crisis after crisis. We had the abnormal winter, the convertibility crisis and so on, and then there was a general running down of confidence in Europe. Country after country fell into economic straits, had to take new measures to protect its reserves. Trade began to contract instead of to expand. There was a downward drift of truly alarming proportions.

Meanwhile we, ourselves, through the disappearance of the U.S. credit which we had counted on as a cushion for three years to give us the breathing space necessary to build up our industry and our export trade, found ourselves thrown back on our own resources in less than two years and forced to draw on our final and ultimate reserves.

It was a very unpleasant position and it was clear one of two things would happen—either the downward drift in Europe would continue until the whole world was plunged again into a fresh economic crash or some great new effort would be required to carry us all round the corner.

Well, that great effort has been forthcoming and it looks to me now as though 1948 may go down in history as the year which marked the turning of the economic tide and it came first through E.R.P., that great initiative taken first by Mr. Marshall and subsequently supported and adopted by the U.S. Congress and people, an initiative taken as only a great nation and a great people could take it.

That was parallelled in Europe by this new movement for the drawing together of the free countries of the West with a view to solving their problems in close collaboration, instead of in competition with each other. It is a movement which goes far beyond the economic and financial field. It is a movement for mutual defence, but, more than that, it is a movement for the rallying of the moral and spiritual forces in Europe against the perils which are only too obvious to all--a movement for the protection of all those standards and values and freedoms and ideals which are the heritage of western civilization and which we are all alike determined to preserve.

Now, we must not expect too much from this too quickly. I notice a certain tendency to imagine that by a wave of the magic wand you can produce a United States of Europe as one political unit, almost, as it were, over night. That is not so. We are dealing here with very old nations, and with their own history of which they are very proud, and naturally, because they have all contributed greatly to the development of the world, with their own traditions, their own background, their own culture and their own language. You cannot expect that they will suddenly forget all about their history and background and merge themselves in one unit. No, the approach must be more gradual and this in ever increasing collaboration, in economic affairs, in defence and indeed in all matters tending to speed up European recovery.

It is this for which Britain has been working. She is playing a leading part in this new movement and we have great hopes from it. Had time permitted, I could have given you some striking illustrations of the new team spirit which is developing in Europe and which we are doing our best to foster and encourage.

Britain is the better able to take the lead in this way since she herself has made remarkable strides this year on the road to recovery—so remarkable indeed that, as you will have seen, Sir Stafford Cripps was able recently to make in the House of Commons his first cheering speech since he became Chancellor of the Exchequer. Britain has now got her second wind after the shocks of 1947 and the results are now beginning to appear. Here are some of them.

In the first place, our industrial production to-day is running at about 25% above pre-war, that is, about a quarter as much again as before the war, and is on a mounting curve.

Secondly, our export trade reached in July a figure of 149% as compared with pre-war—practically half as much again as before the war, and although there was subsequently a seasonal drop, owing to holidays, we are hoping we shall reach the target of 150% by the end of the year. Thirdly, the account for the first six months accounts of this year show that we were able to reduce our over-all deficit with the rest of the world by no less than 55%.

Now, there are two special points which I must mention hurriedly which give us great satisfaction. First of all, the improvement in our invisible earnings. As you will realize, as a great creditor before the war we always imported more than we exported and we relied on our invisible earnings—shipping, insurance, overseas investments—to fill the gap. That, of course, put us in a very bad position after the war because we had to liquidate most of our investments for carrying on the war and our shipping and insurance earnings fell also to very low proportions. To show you the change between our postwar and our pre-war position, I need only mention that before the war we were accustomed to draw $1000 million a year from our invisibles, in aid of our visible trade balance, whereas last year, 1947, so far from having any income at all from that source we had a net deficit on invisibles of $700 million—a turnover of $1700 million against us as compared with before the war.

Well, this year I am glad to tell you, as a result of the improvement in the situation, we have wiped out that deficit on invisible earnings and we are going to start again with a surplus on invisible account.

A second point is that it is not often realized that these results are being achieved at a time when the terms of trade have turned very seriously against us, compared with pre-war. Owing to the scarcity values ruling in the world, we have had to pay nearly three times as much for our imports as before the war and our export prices have never been able to catch up with that rise in import prices. They are still only about two and a half times what they were. Even this year, in 1948, import prices have risen against us about ten per cent, though they are now showing signs of flattening out, whereas our export prices have only risen three per cent. This factor, of course, hinders our export trade because it is bound to be reflected in our export prices. I think we ought to bear that in mind when we are inclined to think, as I sometimes am myself, that British prices are not quite so favourable as they might be. That is a situation that cannot last indefinitely. We are bound to see before very long a drop in commodity prices and, personally, I do not think any factor would contribute more toward the healthy development and expansion of trade.

Meanwhile the fact that this improvement in our situation has been achieved in adverse conditions gives us great encouragement for the future. How is this improved situation reflected in industry? Taking coal first, there has been a very good recovery. We are producing about four million tons per week, as against four and a quarter before the war and with a labour force much reduced as compared to pre-war. We have resumed our exports in coal on a modest scale and that helps our dollar earnings.

In steel, we have hit an all time high of fifteen million tons a year and we have large schemes for expansion which should come to fruition in the next few years.

In shipbuilding we are building more ships than the whole of the rest of the world put together and we hope soon to resume our traditional position as the chief carriers of the world.

In machinery, we are producing half as much as before the war, in textile and agricultural machinery, several hundred per cent more than pre-war. In locomotives, railway wagons and heavy engineering goods, half as much again as before the war. Commercial vehicles, double pre-war, and the exports two and a half times pre-war. Consumption of electric power by industry, 75 per cent above pre-war.

I could give you quite a list of industries in which production is now about double pre-war. I have selected those because coal, steel, transportation, machinery and power are the keys to production and from what I have said I think you will see that the whole productive machine in Britain is really getting at last into top gear.

These results have not been achieved without considerable sacrifice from the British people and I would be the last to pretend that they have. I think they should be regarded as a monument or tribute to their self-discipline, their restraint and self-denial—a self-discipline that can only come from a truly democratic nation.

Of course we have our controversies as to methods. I expect you will have seen from the press that one is raging today. We like that. We should think it very strange indeed if we all had the same opinions about what should be done. We like to blow off steam and have our daily grouse against the Government. That is one of our national pastimes. Don't be misled by it. Underneath all that is a solidity of purpose and determination throughout the country to get Britain back to where she was before.

I haven't time—I would like to tell you some of the methods of conquering inflation—though I must just mention the voluntary agreement this year between Labour, on the one hand, and Management, on the other: Management to limit profits and dividends, and Labour to limit wages and salaries. It is something which in our view would formerly have been regarded as a quite impossible, indeed something which it was almost lunacy to suggest a treading on everybody's corns. Yet this has come about not compulsively but purely voluntarily, as part of a determination throughout the country to overcome this financial trouble.

Well, on the economic side I think it can be said that the stage is now set for a general advance. E.R.P. is acting like a tonic in Europe, and Britain too is forging ahead. But we must not forget that E.R.P. is on a diminishing scale. The aid is to extend over a four year plan and is to decrease each year. Now all these sixteen countries receiving assistance are putting their heads together with a view to drawing up a basis of action so that production can rise each year in Europe as aid diminishes, with the object that at the end of four years every one of them will be able to stand on its own feet without external assistance.

That is the programme, and on paper there is no reason at all why it should not be achieved. It will be a hard struggle. We can't expect things to right themselves too quickly. Nor can we expect much heightening of the present standard of living, but at least we can now see daylight at the end of the tunnel and that in itself is a great encouragement to us all.

Now, what are the results for Canada? In the first instance there should be a great increase in exports from Europe to this hemisphere and particularly in exports from Britain to Canada. Last year we exported from Britain $160 million worth of goods. This year we shall achieve our target of $280 million, and next year should be well over $300 million. I regard that as a foundation rather than an objective. We must go much further and get to $400 or $500 million. It is so vitally important. We have such a tremendous stake in you and you have such a vital stake in us, as one of your biggest markets, and unless we can achieve a better—I don't say a complete balance—a better balance in our trade, the British purchasing power in this market will decline and we must not allow that to happen.

One of the important results of Sir Stafford Cripps's recent visit was, as you may have seen, the appointment of a Continuing Committee composed of representatives of the two Governments to keep a close watch on all developments having a bearing on our trade and economic relations. This Committee will meet alternately in London and Ottawa and its main object will be to take advantage of every opportunity that may occur in this fast moving situation for keeping the volume of trade between us to the maximum that exchange possibilities will allow. And further than that, it will also have the duty of seeing that where adjustments in our mutual trade are required these adjustments are carried out with the least possible adverse impact on the economy of the other party.

Some adjustments will be necessary. We must face that fact. You can't build up Europe without seeing that she gets back her pre-war trade, and if she gets back her pre-war trade we and others must divert some of the purchases we have made over here in recent years back to their pre-war channel. However, those adjustments should not cause any serious impact here. They should be carried out without any great noticeable effect. The object will be keep up the general volume of trade between us and we should be able to do that.

On the economic side, therefore, I feel I can really give you an encouraging report, but it will be very foolish for us to look at the economic side only. That would be ostrich like because it is so entangled with the political side, and we must recognize that on the political front there are some nasty clouds on the horizon which, unless the air is cleared may seriously affect the pace of economic recovery. In the first place we may have to face a diversion of men and materials from much needed peacetime purposes to defence requirements, and the truth is that we have all of us got so many reconstruction jobs to do to get the economy of the world right that we can't really afford to divert people to defence needs without interfering with our economic objectives. Secondly of course, this tension, if it continues is bound to affect confidence between nations. It is bound to make it more difficult to build up that mutual trust between countries on which alone we can hope to erect a stable world.

There is no need for me to elaborate on that. We all know from what quarter the danger arises. Now, either that tension will lighten or it will continue. Your guess is as good as mine. In any case our course is clear. We must stand firm. We must stand firm behind the things in which we believe and refuse to run away from any of our responsibilities or obligations. That is point number one.

Point number two is that we must at the same time have a positive policy, a policy of improving economic conditions in Europe as fast and as widely as we can. The special importance of that, in my view, is to enable this rallying of the moral and spiritual forces which is now going on in Europe to assert itself. I am quite convinced that in this trouble now going on in the world the spirit of man will assert itself and will triumph if it is given a chance. But it must be given that chance and it won't be given it until economic conditions are better.

So I regard that myself as a double-headed policy, and the second head is just as important as the first. Canada is making a tremendous contribution in this field in her advocacy of the North Atlantic Pact which I hope will come about and which will buttress the new movement going on. That will be a tremendous contribution toward insuring security in the world.

Well, if we can get around this corner, and I am confident myself that we shall, a whole new age will open up before us, an age of scientific advance, an age quite unlike any of its predecessors. Where all these great discoveries of science which keep on crowding in on us day by day will be used, not for destructive purposes, but for the advancement of human welfare, for the improvement of standards of living, for the providing of new amenities, for the expansion of trade, for the drawing together of countries, an age promising greater blessings than the world has ever known.

One of the things that gives me greatest encouragement at this time is the way in which good comes out of evil. And it is coming out. We are seeing formed before our eyes a great new unity of purpose, a new brotherhood, if you like, which sees itself manifested not only in the Commonwealth—and our relations in the Commonwealth have never been closer than today—but which embraces also that great neighbour to the south of us. It reminds me of the words of Mr. Winston Churchill, in one of his great speeches in the war. You will remember his remarking of the United States how increasingly we were mixed up together in our affairs, "It is a process", he said, "which, like the Mississippi, just keeps rolling on and nothing in this world is going to stop it". I think in that great unity and closer brotherhood lies our greatest safeguard for maintaining peace in the world, and our greatest guarantee we shall together enter that new age to which I have referred.

(Applause—prolonged.)

At the request of the President, Mr. Colebrook thanked the guest speaker.

"THE SOCIAL IMPLICATION OF TELEVISION"

An Address By

NORMAN COLLINS

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, December 2nd, 1948

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

I sometimes wonder what the historians of the future will have to say about man's scientific achievements during the past three or four decades. Surely no period in history can boast of so many amazing discoveries and scientific inventions; to mention but a few, Radio, the splitting of the Atom, Radar and now Television.

Our speaker today is Mr. Norman Collins, Controller of Television for the British Broadcasting Corporation.

After a career as a writer, journalist and publisher, Mr. Collins entered the service of the B.B.C. in 1941.

His first assignment was to superintend broadcasts in the North American Service and subsequently in all the Overseas Services. Then he took complete charge of the General Overseas Service which was heard the world over by British forces serving abroad and by their families at home. During this period Mr. Collins travelled extensively to find out what his listeners really wanted.

After the war ended he started B.B.C.'s first daily programme for women which now reaches a regular audience of three and a half million.

Mr. Collins is the author of ten books, his last novel "London Belongs To Me" was a best seller and has since been filmed under the title "Dulcimer Street." Incidentally, if you are a movie fan you can see it at the Odeon Theatre here in Toronto, where it is being featured at present.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Norman Collins, whose subject will be "The Social Implication of Television".

Mr. Chairman and Members of The Empire Club of Canada:

I have got two preliminary remarks to make. The first is I felt very self-conscious as I came in this room. I felt I had disturbed you all in the middle of a rather late breakfast. The second thing is that I have never felt more at home in my life than when I found brussels sprouts on my plate.

But I want to get back to these remarks which your Chairman has just been good enough to utter about me, because to my ears there was a rather horrid obituary ring about them. They sounded like the kind of obituary columns that are found in the better class newspapers, where rare innuendoes and honesty are weighed together. And, as your Chairman was doing absolutely nothing about me I thought I would first of all tell you something about myself, and around about 4.15 or 4.45, we will get on to this subject of the Magic of Television, because if I tell you something about myself first you won't have the slightest idea if what I tell you about Television has any sense or not.

I don't mean this to be a kind of public confession. I don't intend to tell you whether I always pack those tiny tablets of hotel soap—I do! Nor why I give over-generously to the Police Orphanage when I have a motor offence summons coming up. No. I propose to tell you the more serious things about myself, because unless you know what a man thinks and feels you know nothing about him.

The first thing I would say is I belong, politically, in England to that centre party which for a remarkable number of years has to content itself with believing the absolute worst about whatever party happens to be in office while maintaining complete faith in the silly asses who put them there.

You have already noted the definition of a Liberal. I use the word "Liberal" in the English sense and as a Liberal, and here I am speaking quite seriously—I mean that I regard toleration as the most important human asset in the world today and without toleration I believe we might as well climb back into our primitive caves and wait for the forces of the jungle to devour us.

Now, another thing that you should know about me, because Television has a cross-connection with the movement, is that I am a profound believer in the ancient institution of the family and I view with a certain amount of credulity those societies where the mistress of the household changes practically with the seasons.

I now speak with the voice of pure prejudice: I am unashamedly pro-British to a ridiculous extent and I believe that the British Commonwealth of Nations offers more to the world today than any other agglomeration of nations can offer.

Now, from what I have said you will gather that I am a Liberal of the Manchester school of about 1870. Instead of coming along here today by taxi I should have bundled down in a growler with my top hat resting on a Malacca cane between my knees.

The last I will say about myself is that as a member of the British Broadcasting Corporation I have no political, no religious and no social views whatsoever.

Well, now that you know something about me and you can judge anything at all that I may have to say about television, because I would say that I regard television as the most powerful, easily the most powerful, most potent instrument of social influence which has been invented in our lifetime. It is potent for a very simple reason and that is that the influence which it exerts is exerted within our own homes. Do not imagine that when Television comes to Canada and you go out and buy your television set you are doing anything which remotely resembles a new electric mixer or even a new sound radio set. Nothing of the sort.

When I transferred my allegiance in the B.B.C. from sound radio to television I promptly named the other form blind radio, and I want you to consider the films you used to see which were silent films. You remember they quite suddenly came to life when voice was added to sight. In the same way if you have once seen television programmes even though there are certain fields such as music where I do not know what Television adds.

But if you think that Television has this same extraordinary power of compulsion as the films, just pause a moment. I am going to utter two very chastening thoughts. The first is very chastening; the second, positively downright terrifying. The first is when you have Television you are virtually giving up the latch-key of your home. That no doubt sends a shudder through the large meeting. The second thing that is going to make you pause and send an even deeper shudder is this: It is quite all right that I should be talking to you now, but just imagine if when you get home you found I through a television set was talking to your wives and children! I thought that would make you think.

I want to mention children because they are really the crux of the matter. I am not afraid of corrupting a company such as this one. We have all probably done a bit of corrupting ourselves in our own time. But children are very different indeed and I can assure you when the time comes that you instal a television set in your house it will need a shorn-off shotgun and a posse of police to keep any child away from that set. And children are really the vitally important thing we have to think about and I want to put it to you that television can condition the thoughts and the attitude to life of children and within one generation. I mean this perfectly seriously.

I mean also that Television, the immediate availability of television beside one's hearth means the child's taste in Art, in Drama, in Literature, to some extent, in Music certainly, in the kindred art of the Ballet will inevitably be formed by this instrument which is within the home. I don't think it stops there because a child, you know, is very impressionable and you will find that the children are basing their whole habits of speech and their taste in dress on the persons which they see familiarily on this television set at the side of the fire.

I would go so far as to say that if Hitler were alive today and ever since that election took place in this rebel colony over the border, I don't predict anything, therefore, I say if Hitler were alive today I believe he would be perfectly content to allow sound radio to remain in the hands of anyone, provided he himself had control of the nation's television.

It is because I believe Television to be so potent a force that I am alarmed by some of the developments which I have seen in Television. I do not believe that a great number of people who are possessing television or possessing the means of transmitting television are aware of the social responsibility and there is one phrase which I see is recurrent and that is Television is referred to as "a magic casement." Well, I just wonder if the person who first used the term happens to know the rest of the quotation. I assume they don't, therefore I remind you the rest of the quotation goes on to say "looking out on the seas of peril and the fairylands that are forlorn". Therefore, every time you hear the quotation, ask yourselves how the rest of the quotation goes.

It is because of the social force of television that I have been very much impressed by your Canadian wisdom in refusing to be stampeded into converting every Canadian home into a miniature movie theatre. Now, I don't think that Canada could or should remain very much longer without Television. I don't recommend an attitude of sage-like Chinese wisdom, where a thousand years later the C.B.C. will be sitting down studying the implications of the previous thousand years. I would put it this way: You could have had television, you could have had Television today, have had Television yesterday, you could certainly have it tomorrow, and I am very glad indeed that you haven't, because it shows that you are pausing to consider what the implications are.

Now comes a question as to what system should be adopted when Canada does take on Television and do not imagine, please, that I shall make any recommendation—nothing is to be further from my purpose—I would like to suggest that the alternative methods are these: You may decide it shall be placed in the hands of one public corporation. There is a great deal to be said for that because I know to my cost one public corporation is a target for public abuse and the public feels enormously better when it has done a bit of abusing.

On the other hand it may be placed in the hands of the commercial stations where the sheer pressure of commercial energy will achieve progress.

At that I will pause in making one of those subtle silences that underline a thing so much and say Progress toward what?—and hurriedly going on to say this, or it may be the combination of a public corporation and private commercial enterprise. I have no views as to which it should be and even if I had any views in this Society wild horses would not drag them from me.

But it has occurred to me it might be worth while saying a word about the British system of Television because the British system of Television happens to be not merely the first in the world but also at this moment the best in the world and if I am reported as saying anything may I say, as an Englishman I am proud to utter those words.

B.B.C. has known about Television and has been operating already in daily service for six years. It has been made quite ridiculously easy for the B.B.C. to do it because the B.B.C. collects a £1 license which 11.5 million people every year are pleased to pay. That doesn't mean we have a revenue of eleven and a half million pounds, because quite apart from the absent-minded people who forget to pay, there are also those things called collection fees which the people at another post office take from the money collected on the way.

As you know, I am not only connected with the B.B.C. but I am also in my own right an author, and I have always paid the ten per cent. I don't know whether you have heard the story of the literary agent who saw his literary client go out of the room and said, "There goes the swine who takes ninety per cent of my income." Well, the B.B.C. has an income of approximately £11,000,000 sterling per year and in 1935 there was a Committee set up under Lord Salsverg which authorized the B.B.C. to spend such portions of the revenue as it saw fit upon the exploitation of Television. At the moment the amount of money which the B.B.C. spends on Television is approximately £1,000,000 sterling per year. My income from straight television sources is rather under £125,000 a year, despite the fact that I spend £1,000,000. This £125,000 comes from 75,000 people, good enough and kind enough to pay a £2 license which enables them to operate a television receiver as well as a sound set.

You may say straight away, what is this man talking about when he proceeds to be vain glorious about British television if only 75,000 are license holders? On that part I would remind you of the piece of European trouble in which my country got involved rather recently which means we are extraordinarily short of any kind of raw material and the only way in which raw material can be made available is if we in England decide to export it to you. We, in fact, are at the disreputable end of an export drive. We are engaging in sheer selfishness when we talk about making a television set for our own use and at this moment in the south of England there is only one television station, a very powerful one that throws across a radius of 60 to 70 miles. These are orders with British radio trade in Great Britain for one million receivers. The rate of production is at the rate of 5,000 receivers a month and I don't go to sleep at night trying to divide 5,000 a month into 1,000,000 and wondering how mature I, personally, shall be when all those orders have been fulfilled and I pray to Heaven that no one will order another receiver in the meantime.

But the B.B.C. cannot be content, obviously cannot be content with one transmitter only in the south of England. This is a point I have been at pains to explain because the internal politics of Great Britain are rather complicated.

There is a curious belief that the farther north you come the more hard-working you are, and those of us who live in the south are just the soft people of the plains. It is very important indeed that the B.B.C. should hurriedly develop a national network. The B.B.C. is doing so. By the end of the summer of next year there will be the next station opened on even greater power which will bring in six million additional viewers.

Now, there is one other problem which should be mentioned. Why is the B.B.C. not hurriedly covering the whole of Great Britain? That is because of this thing called a rearmament programme. I don't mean to say at this moment we are being stopped doing anything strictly for reasons of rearmament. What I do mean is this, there is in Britain today in a very carefully planned economy, an apportionment of preference and as the demand of armaments comes first the engineers of the B.B.C. cannot erect their television stations and if I were asked which is the most important, rearmament or television, I will evade the answer.

There is one thing you should know about Television—it is not cheap. It cannot be cheap. The station requires approximately six times as many men for each operation as would be taken in sound radio. It costs approximately six times as much and is, in its effectiveness, I suggest, somewhere about thirty-six times as great.

Having said that, unless I tell you what the B.B.C. is doing you have no standard by which to judge. The B.B.C. puts out regularly every week two ninety-minute programmes of original drama. That means Shakespeare, Sheridan, Shaw, Noel Coward—always two plays of ninety minutes duration. I find the programmes to be enormously popular and embarrassingly popular, because the public writes in and says that it looks at everything. In fact I never receive a letter from anyone that doesn't make it obvious that the writer of that letter ought to be in charge of Television rather than me, because I have to tend to some of the programmes and that fortunate person is merely looking at them, but I don't find as serious competition as there might have been. If the films were a little better I don't know that the growth of television would be as rapid but when I look down the columns of the movie advertisements and see that the choice is a play by Bernard Shaw or "Kiss the Blood Off My Hands",—well, I think they choose Bernard Shaw.

Now, I don't want you to imagine all the B.B.C. does is put on ninety minutes of dramatics. That is not true. It happens because of difficulties about the Western Royalty Management in London, who were alarmed about the growth of television, I proceeded to send my producers to the continent and the result is London has seen more of the best of French cabaret than they have ever seen before. The leading ballet companies of Europe are I think a little better than the leading ballet companies of Britain, so the leading ballet companies of the continent are seen in Television.

I don't want you to be led to believe that dramatics, cabaret and ballet are all that the people receive. Some of us here believe rather passionately in the British Commonwealth of Nations and there was this Dominion Prime Ministers Conference held in Downing Street in October. In the ordinary way that would have received the kind of respectful cursory tribute that the Press know how to hand out to something that is important, but the cursory reader is not very much interested. I agreed that Television would do what it could and with the duplicity of the Secretary of State television cameras were introduced into Downing Street. I found it exciting and other people did, too, judging by the letters, to sit at home and see not only the Dominion Ministers arriving at 10 Downing Street, but Prime Minister Atlee meeting and greeting them and brief interviews on the terrace and grounds of Downing Street.

That wasn't all. The B.B.C. Television Service are preparing a film showing the geographical relationship between the countries of the Commonwealth and their own immediate neighbours. This film was made more interesting by showing shorts of the national life of the countries which were involved and on the last day of the Conference there was separate film interviews with every visiting Premier and the Secretary of State came on and put the questions which were answered and you heard on a separate sound track the visiting Ministers answering the questions to them. I found that a fascinating programme and I do not believe that any harm could have been done that my own people should have seen an hour and a half of Commonwealth affairs during the peak period of the evening's transmission.

Now, to come back to this serious business of Television, and I was grossly misrepresented when it was said that I was going to talk about "the Magic of Television", because "Magic" suggests I should do some conjuring tricks and I have nothing at this moment up my sleeve nor will there be. What I am going to say is simply this: I believe that Television can, if it is properly handled and handled in a responsible spirit enormousy enrich the national life of the country that has it. I would not go so far as a certain Catholic Priest who said he regarded Television as a marriage building instrument because it kept people at home. I reflected that one or two programmes for which I was responsible would have broken up any normal marriage at once. Nor, on the other hand, would I say I regard television as representing the destruction of home life and being the end of all conversation and reading because I do remember there was a 16th century schoolman who attacked reading on the ground that it destroyed contemplation. Nor do I regard Television as being a short cut to Happiness. It has nothing to do with that and about five nights ago when I was sitting up in one of those sleeping compartments in the car which it seems I have occupied for the past month, I was reading the poems of Robert Bridges and I found Robert Bridges said everything I have tried to say about Television not being a short cut to Happiness. Bridges wrote it even before Television existed. Bridges was talking about energy and he said that "Energy is to be found flitting to mock the ear that heareth well", which I take it to be a reference to sound radio, "and to escape the trained eyes which sees in seeing", which I take quite definitely to be a reference to Television.

Now, having said I do not regard Television as a short cut to Happiness I do say I look forward to the day, which I hope will be soon, when Television comes to Canada, and I would ask only one thing of you, that having taught your family how to tune the set properly and how to focus it, you also teach and instruct your own family how to turn the set off again. Thank you.

(Applause.)

At the request of the President, Mr. Stapells thanked the Guest-Speaker.

"THE COMMONWEALTH ON TRIAL"

AN ADDRESS BY

MAJOR FREDERICK J. NEY, M.C., LL.D., F.R.G.S.

Chairman: The First Vice-President, Mr. T. A. Pugsley

Thursday, December 9th, 1948

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

No one need apologize here for having a feeling of affection for things British. This feeling, the speaker I am about to introduce, has shown in 1946 when he addressed us concerning "The Empire in Africa and the Middle East".

Major Ney is a man of energy and enthusiasm. Things ideal appeal to him. His life has been lived in touch with scholarship and with the enterprise associated with the British name.

Of three Royal Societies he is a Fellow, by the University of St. Andrews, he has been honoured with a Doctorate of Laws. In Western Canada he achieved distinction in education in the Province of Manitoba. Three times mentioned in despatches and decorated for valour by British, French and Belgian Governments, he has demonstrated fully his devotion to the cause of liberty.

During the last war, the Ministry of Information of the United Kingdom found his services of use and he was employed in Africa, in the Middle East and, after the war, in Germany.

Recently he has travelled thousands of miles and has visited places removed from us.

From this experience, and with the appreciation of one who is an educator, and possessed of the meaning of history. Major Ney is now to address us concerning

THE COMMONWEALTH ON TRIAL

Many in the audience will recall the story told of a visitor to the National Gallery in Trafalgar Square, London. His visit was more by accident than of choice and he had little interest in art.

Going forward he noticed a number of people standing before a work of one of the Great Masters. He glanced at it: was unimpressed and passed on.

Hurriedly making the rounds of the Gallery, he came back to the same picture. Before it was gathered an even larger crowd. Going up to someone who appeared to know something about the pictures he said, "You know, I just can't understand what those people see in that picture". "Sir", said the Curator, "That picture is to be seen. It is not on trial, it is you who are on trial".

I suppose the story could be told quite as appropriately of the crowds which visit such ancient ruins as Glastonbury Abbey or Fountains Abbey. What is it that one sees—or fails to see? The degree of failure to see in these monuments the pageant of our past surely is the measure of the extent to which we are on trial or are being tested. In this spirit let us then look at England.

I say England deliberately, for here today I propose to indulge my right to speak as an Englishman, rather than as a citizen of Canada, if only because my own countrymen are too often to be found among the Empire's worst enemies. England, say her critics, is finished: Her story has been told. If that were true and in spite of all temptation I'd still rather be an Englishman than belong to any race on Earth—or elsewhere! But her story is not finished. She will once more save herself by her exertions and do much to save Western civilization by her example.

In the accomplishment of that task, however, she will need the close company of those who honestly believe in those things for which, through a thousand years and more, she has so valiantly stood.

There is so much more in England than mere economics, politics, or those superficial things which characterise a modern nation. Things which so many of her own sons and daughters and visitors of good-will regret and detest. Behind this facade there is to be seen by those with the will to see, an England of centuries of service and sacrifice, with a heart that still beats soundly, despite all suggestions to the contrary, an England that will find her way back to "dignity and greatness and peace again".

Her back to the wall again, as at Dunkirk, her aspirations have not changed; they are still for the ultimate good of all men. Despite the petty partisanship of political strife and the prejudiced minds of political theorists, England remains, as Emerson said just over 100 years ago, still ready "to execute the policy which the mind and heart of mankind requires in the present hour". That was said in Manchester in 1847.

What is it that mankind requires in this hour—in 1948, and how is our goal to be achieved?

What I have said by way of introduction to what must be, I am afraid, a very inadequate analysis of my subject, is, of course, altogether un-English, and I should be blushing furiously. But I make no apologies, neither for the views already expressed, nor for those to follow. I hope to prove provocative and should I appear dogmatic, I know you will forgive me, for you, too, as members of the Empire Club, feel these matters deeply, and we share a common anxiety.

As your President has reminded you, I have, during the past four or five years, visited many parts of the world. It is upon the experience of these years that I base today's observations. Those experiences, which have given me a very clear picture of the world-wide organization of Communism, can be summed up in one sentence: Everywhere I have found the people waiting—waiting for England and the Empire to lead. In not a few of the countries I have visited, they waited in vain for such a lead after the First World War. The Second World War was the direct result. Why was that lead withheld then, and why is it still being withheld, or given hesitantly and unconvincingly? Let us try to find at least some part of the answer to that question.

Following the first War, one devastating reaction to the immense sacrifices we made was large due to the suggestion that others would take up the torch, and at least for a space, we, the Empire, could relax and leave the burden of leadership to the United States. A million had died, and over two million men, mutilitated in mind and body, or both, came home to be nursed and cared for, in a large percentage of cases, for life. The services of these men were lost to England. Indeed, they constituted a considerable burden upon the National Exchequer.

But that is not all, not by any means. The processes of Voluntary enlistment had not only swallowed up an immense part of the cream of the nation's youth; it had robbed its population of at least three million of its potential sons and daughters; those who might have been.

No other nation, friend or foe, suffered so irreparable a loss, and if today it can be said that the English nation falters and follows blindly the strange goods of political theorists and pseudo-intellectuals, remember please, those missing millions. It will be long before their places are filled. Here, then, is some part of the answer, if any doubt or question the England of today. But it is only a part: the Second World War has taken further heavy toll.

It will not be denied that the future of civilization—no less than that—rests very largely with three great powers; the United States; Russia and the Empire. As has been said before, this world is precariously poised as upon the apex of a triangle, the legs of which are comprised of these three powerful groups. Obviously, if even that precarious position is to be maintained, there must be an equal division of the strain involved.

And here then, we face a situation which should make us pause; for obviously that third leg of the tripod—the Empire—*is* weaker than the other two, unwarrantably so. Because of this fact the international situation daily becomes more tense and dangerous. The equipoise between East and West is unstable because the Empire is unable to exert that influence which, by virtue of history, experience, and its international composition, is its essential role in world affairs. At the most critical juncture in history, it is failing because it speaks with many voices, hesitates to stand fast upon tried and proved principles, and doubts its power in the one sphere that really matters—the spiritual front. It is here where we are most certainly upon trial—and that means you and me—all of us. Were I the prosecuting Counsel I should address you, something like this:

> "Why is it, gentlemen of the Empire Club, that in these past four years or so, by your apathy or your doubts, you have allowed the name of the Empire to be traduced, not merely by our obvious enemies, but in our midst? Why have you made no concerted stand against this damnable conspiracy to rob mankind of its most powerful friend, and the persistent advocate of its freedom? Is it possible that you were so blind that you did not see that by this failure so to stand you were endangering the very foundations of man's hope and robbing him of that confidence which is the mainspring of all progress? You became ashamed of the very word Empire, for which so much blood and service had been rendered. Did you think it would be forgotten in a new name and that 'Commonwealth' would obscure a past which is the greatest envy of our enemies?
>
> You pioneered in the sky and Imperial Airway became an honoured name and the symbol of that safety which the Navy had, in days past, secured upon the Seas. That name! what have you done with it?
>
> You sent messages the world round via Imperial. That, too, has gone, or largely so. Was it so very offensive?"

One link after another has gone, until we come to what surely must be the final assault upon our unity and our self-respect, when, in one breath, as it were, the word British is abolished in its Commonwealth connotation, and the suggestion is made that new Republics can be both in and out of the Empire at the same time!

If such monstrous proposals are accepted, then indeed is our tale told. A good club does not beg its members to remain; neither is its standing appraised by its size. Nor does it readily change an honoured name in the hope of retaining old members or of gaining new. The circumstances of such a club would be all too obvious and it would soon close its doors. It is now possible that further hurried evolution is envisaged, and yet another name is contemplated? For example, "The Union of non-British or other Republics"? This is nonsense, of course, but let us not be too complaisant about this matter, for the name by which this mighty organization of free people is known to the world concerns so much more than the Empire itself.

It is bad enough that we wrangle among ourselves over our nomenclature, and so disparage our past and discount our future. But the suggested and implied retreat from ourselves is deplorable in its effect and wraught with much more peril than retreat from an easily discerned enemy. This defeatism on our part has been disastrous, and few things have affected our prestige in the world so much as this one single factor. It has made us suspect as any change of name is apt to be! If time permitted, I could, I think, prove this contention from my experience in many countries, but we must hurry on.

If we *must* change our name, then why not merely "The Empire" or "The Britannic League"? The word "Britannic" antedates the occupation of India and the Declaration of Independence. Here is a name which derives from a history of service to the world and indicates at least our historical origin, whereas merely the word Commonwealth does not. It applies, of course, to Australia or it can suggest a political party now in liquidation. Or if "Commonwealth" it is to be, and not "British", then why not "The Greater Commonwealth", thus leaving the door open for others to enter?

But the strength of England and the Empire derives from its continuity of history and to break with that is merely political folly, but to depreciate still further that prestige which was the United Nations greatest asset in War as it might have been in peace.

It was here that we failed. It is for this we stand on trial. It was not that the numerous problems which confronted us were beyond our capacity or powers. It was in our failure, battered and bruised though we were, to maintain our ancient prestige. True it was the Royal Navy upon which this largely rested, and which produced the Pax Britannica, the return of which would bring a sigh of relief to hundreds of millions of poor, harrassed, fearful people throughout the world.

Let me give you two or three illustrations. You will recall that about 18 months ago there were riots in Canton. The British Consul was wounded and the Consulate burnt to the ground. An eye witness, himself a Chinese, said to me sometime afterwards, "If there had been a British battleship in the Bay, that would not have happened and many lives would have been saved. Not a shot would have been fired. It would have been enough that the big ship should be there".

As you well know, there has been not a little agitation in China over the retention of Hong Kong. We should go, said even Chang Kai Shek. I asked a Chinese doctor, who was breakfasting with me some two or three months ago, what he thought about this thorny question. He replied: "We should all be sorry to see England leave. The pity is Hong Kong is so small and that it is becoming so overcrowded. It is the one haven of peace and centre of stability in China. No—no one now really wants England to go". I should add here that when Hong Kong was occupied after hostilities had ended the population was 600,000. Today it is over 2,000,000 and refugees are still pouring in.

My third illustration is of a different character and some of you may find it difficult to believe.

During the World War I had the privilege of getting to know some of the Nationals of those countries overrun by the Germans and who found asylum in England. A popular subject of discussion was the possibility of this or that country joining the Empire as a sovereign nation. "Why not?" they would ask. "This is what we ought to have done after the First World War. If we had done that there would not have been another".

When the War was over, I visited those countries to find out if these friends I had made during their "occupation of London" had been indulging in mere courtesies under the emotional strains and stresses of war. That, strange as it may seem, gentlemen, was not the case. They were sincere in their desire for partnership in this much maligned Empire of ours, as was Austria after the First War. Here, surely, was something much better than Western Union largely dominated as it may well be, by a divided and warring France.

But, sad to tell, it was obvious confidence had been shaken. They had met with but little encouragement in London because, so it was said, as in 1920, in the case of Austria, the difficulties were likely to be insuperable, and that this or that 'great power' would not approve! There was another factor, however, for already there were signs of disintegration within the Empire itself, and one must think twice of alliance with a power that is obviously beginning to lose faith in itself.

As in business, so it is between nations, and the point I want to make here is this: The defeatism implicit in the retreat from our own world-wide Imperial designation and our persistent disparagement, actual or implied, has constituted our greatest disservice to the Peace, as it has to the cause of Imperial unity.

This is a serious criticism, gentlemen. It implies a personal responsibility for much of what is happening today, from which we cannot escape. We are indeed on trial, and it is not our first offence. But because of our past contribution to the well-being of the world, the Great Architect may yet give us one more opportunity to carry forward the building of His Temple, and if this should be, what are we going to do about it? To answer this adequately would need much more time than I have at my disposal, but I shall nevertheless attempt an answer.

You will recall, I am sure, a warning which Ruskin gave England and the Empire nearly a century ago. Let me repeat it:

> "Since first the dominion of men was asserted over the ocean, three thrones, of mark beyond all others, have been set upon its sands; the thrones of Tyre, Venice and England. Of the first . . . only the memory remains; of the second, the ruin . . . the third, which inherits their greatness, if it forget their example, may be led through prouder eminence to less pitied destruction".

"If we forget this example!" I would rather use the word "story" than example, and I'm sure that is what Ruskin really meant, for words have greatly changed in usage during the past century. If then, we forget their story, the story of Tyre and Venice, we may be "led through prouder eminence to less pitied destruction".

What is their story? Surely the story of nations risen to greatness and then forgetting those things upon which that greatness was founded. What are those qualities by means of which we, as an Empire, have grown great, and are so obviously in danger of forgetting?

Surely the qualities which constitute the very keystone of the Imperial Arch can be summarized in one word—Faith. Faith in God and faith in ourselves and in the mission with which He has entrusted us. The Faith in which we stood alone in 1940; the Faith which Walter Lippman then said we "had given back to the world". The Faith of Alfred the Great who saw, nearly 11 centuries ago "a greater England rising from strength to strength, a bulwark against tyranny and a sure refuge for all distressed folk".

Here, surely, is the lesson to be learned from the history of Tyre and Venice, distant in time and in achievement as they are; that we lose not this Faith, enriched as it is by two thousand years of rich experience and incomparable achievement.

There is but one solution to the world's apparently insoluble problems. No political device or ideology, or new economic orders or grandiose planning can bring peace to the haunted men and women in their hundreds of millions the world round. Nothing but a real Renaissance can now save man from his own inventions, for the Atomic Bomb will be as destructive to his spirit in peace as it would be to his body in war. He is fitted for its use in neither field.

Said the Frenchman Rabelais, many years ago, "Science is Wisdom: Conscience is a greater wisdom. If there should come a time when these two should be divorced from each other then Hell would be let loose upon the earth".

Can one doubt that that time, that divorce, is fast moving upon us? On all sides principles have been jettisoned in the interest of expediency. Man's freedom and welfare are matters of raucous and bitter debate, and subject to the market prices of conscienceless politicians. Hunger and misery beyond understanding stalk the earth, and rampant murder goes unchecked and unpunished.

Yes, surely we are on trial. In the days of the Empire's strength no injustice was too unimportant to go unchallenged, or life too humble to be taken without the law. Men then took courage wherever they saw the flag, and in simple thought and unspoken word blessed that ministering power which, in some completely incomprehensible manner, encircled the earth and found its way to the most inaccessible places.

It was, of course, the Pax Britannica. You may say: "Its days are past". I do not agree. Material power may and has passed into other hands. That power, the power of the United States, must be married to the world experience and the broad humanity of England and the Empire. Together, they may bring peace to the world.

But the first condition to that marriage is that each bring an acceptable dowry to the Union. Only a United Empire, unashamed of its name, and reinforced by its recaptured faith in God and in itself, can assure the success of such a marriage. Only by the power invoked by such unity will the Empire prove a readily acceptable partner to the United States. We shall be fully acceptable only if successful. Let the Empire ignore this fact, and it will pass into the history it has so largely made, its several parts falling either into the ravishing hands of Russian Communism or into the basket of the new Economic Imperialism of the United States.

We are certainly on trial at this time even more than in 1941.

> Humanity with all its fears
> With all the hopes of future years

Is hanging breathless . . . is hanging breathless . . . upon our will to serve it through our unity, our faith in our mission, and in our unrivalled experience in teaching nations how to live.

> In 1916, Walter Hines Page, writing from England said: "Europe would be a bloody slave pen but for these people. It is a shambles as it is".

And in 1940—24 years later—another great American, Dorothy Thompson, wrote:

> "This ancient structure (the British Empire Dorothy's British, not mine!) cemented with blood, is an incredibly delicate and exquisite mechanism held together lightly now by imponderable elements of credit and prestige, experience and skill, written and unwritten law, codes and habits. It is the only world-wide organization in existence, the world equaliser, and holder of the equilibrium, the only world-wide stabilizing force for law and order on this planet; and if you bring it down, the planet will rock with an earthquake such as it has never known. We, in the United States, will shake with that earthquake and so will Germany. And the Britons, the Canadians, the New Zealanders, the Australians, the South Africans, are hurling their bodies into the breach to dam the dykes against world chaos".

I need not remind you, gentlemen, that these words were addressed to Hitler in that year of true Imperial Greatness, 1940. The breach was held, Hitler failed.

But the real battle has yet to be won against a more subtle foe whose bridgeheads have been established in every corner of the world. It is not only Communism with which we are faced, but a rapidly growing avalanche of hatred against all decent things and against God Himself. The world itself is in danger of becoming another Belsen, devoid of all sense of shame, order and law. It was John Pym who said in 1641:

> "If you take away Law, all things will fall into confusion! every man will become a law unto himself which, in the depraved condition of human nature, must needs produce many great enormities".

In my recent travels I have had the opportunity to see something of these "great enormities", and it is because of these experiences that I want to urge upon you all the recognition of the tremendous, almost overwhelming responsibility which rests upon the Empire today. This is no time for anything but the charting of the clearest courses in the same spirit of unity and purpose and with that confidence and faith in our destiny such as characterised those magnificent days of 1940-41. Let us think and act greatly and always with the wellbeing of our children's children in mind, not merely of the present, lest we, coming to the end of the road, hear from afar back the cry of a younger generation:

"If any question why we died,
Tell them our fathers lied."

and one of our greatest lies is the lie which issues not only from our enemies without, but from those within—the lie which traduces the name of Empire and the names of those great souls who laboured and died in its service. Here is implicit an arrongance which is insufferable, for were we, who inherit this great estate, possessed of half the spirit of those who built and passed it on to us, the world today would be an infinitely happier and kindlier place. Mankind would take courage and begin to hope again.

I began this address with a story: let me end with a personal experience.

During the war, I lectured up and down Great Britain for the Ministry of Information.

At a Naval Occasion on the East Coast my Chairman was the Deputy Lord-Lieutenant of the County. In introducing me—as a visitor from Canada—he suggested, with some degree of satisfaction, it would seem, that twice within a quarter of a century Germany had been fooled into believing that at the first shot to be fired the British Empire would fall to pieces.

For the first time, or so I think, I was slightly rude to my Chairman. Here was a statement which, as I see it, goes right to the heart of the matter, and I submitted that it would be much more to our credit if we made it clear to all and sundry, friends and potential enemies alike, that come what may, we stand together. War is too costly a business as a medium for demonstrating our unity. Our responsibility to a world disintegrating at a pace not easily understood demands that we make this unity axiomatic in all our relationships.

And so that there may be no mistake as to our identity, or suggestion of shame for our past, let me urge again, that we halt our retreat from our historic and honourable name. Speaking from experience in many countries, I am confident that this is a vital necessity if our prestige is to be restored and reinforced, and the Empire is again to become that stabilising influence in the world so essential to its peace.

"If", said Winston Churchill, "we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall have lost the future".

Christmas Meeting

"ON RESTING MERRY IN 1948"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. B. K. SANDWELL, B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse.

Thursday, December 16th, 1948.

MADAM SENATOR,
HONOURED GUESTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Our guest of honour today, Dr. B. K. Sandwell, Editor-in-Chief of "Saturday Night" really needs no introduction to a Toronto audience and I feel that I would be very remiss if I trespassed on his time with any long introduction.

B.K. as he is affectionately known to all his friends in the publishing world, has had a brilliant career as a journalist, freelance writer and author.

He also spent four years as Assistant Professor of Economics at McGill University, and two years as head of the English Department at Queen's University, and in a few moments I think you will agree he is truly a man of letters.

High honours came to Dr. Sandwell in 1925 when he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada.

The subject of Dr. Sandwell's address today is "On Resting Merry In 1948"—he does not seem to have left much time—personally, I have not the least idea what that means or what he is going to talk about, but having heard B.K. speak on many former occasions, I know we have a treat in store; his ready wit and brilliant satire interspersed with much profound wisdom is always very refreshing.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Dr. B. K. Sandwell, B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.,—in short, B.K.

Mr. President, Ladies and Fellow Members of The Empire Club: What a poor thing is the ordinary human speaking voice when placed in competition with the kind of thing that we have just heard and that you are going to hear again in a few minutes. How can I have the nerve —I, who have nothing of any real importance to say to you, who am really a hyphen, an intermission, so to speak, thrown in between the two main portions of the programme—how can I have the nerve to stand up and talk to you even about a Christmas Carol, for I must assure you, Mr. President, that the words of the title of my address are taken from the words of a Christmas Carol which begins "God rest you, Merry Gentlemen", and which I thought would be more particularly appropriate for me to use in an address to the male Members of the Empire Club on the one occasion in the year in which they have their lady friends with them and might therefore reasonably be in some danger of dismay.

This Club, for many years, has recognized the impossibility of being merry at Christmas time without including the fair sex in the proceedings of the merriment, and this occasion, this annual event, is one which I think should be encouraged and which I am determined to encourage by making my remarks as brief as possible.

I was going, Mr. President, to talk to this audience about the causes, the basis for merriment which exist in these closing weeks of the year 1948 and I wasn't going to confine it very strictly to that because, after all, we shall very shortly be in the year 1949. I thought perhaps I should say a few things about the power situation in Southern Ontario, about the prospective difficulties of the Berlin air lift when the snow really settles in Berlin, about the alarming rise in the prices of everything, and about the still more alarming indications that possibly prices may be about to stop rising, about the use of the veto in the United Nations, and the very fortunate fact that we don't need to use any veto because our side has a majority in the United Nations, about the lack of peace in China and about the equally alarming prospect that peace may be established in China by people of whom we do not wholly approve.

It seems to me that all those subjects would make a good foundation for an address on resting merry at this particular moment of the year, and it occurred to me perhaps that was too large a subject for a hyphen intermission speech which I feel should be limited very strictly to fifteen minutes, and I decided to talk about oleomargarine.

I don't want to treat that as a frivolous subject. Oleomargarine is a subject of deep social significance. Most of you, I am convinced from the conversations I have had with some of you, don't even know how to pronounce it. There is no reason why you should know how to pronounce it, seeing you were prohibited by law from asking for it. But now that we are no longer prohibited by law, I have hastened to consult the dictionaries and encyclopedias and I have found that it is pronounced with the "g" being hard, as in the expression, "Give us some", and the "i" short. It is not Mar-jarēne, but Mar'-garine. I give you that on the authority of the Oxford Dictionary and I will back the Oxford Dictionary against anyone.

It may interest you further to know that the derivation of the term comes from a Greek word meaning "pearl", and I have not yet found anybody who has the slightest idea what connection there is between pearls and oleo. But one thing about oleo is that it is a substitute for butter and, Mr. President, here we get to our ground for making merry, for I believe this to be the first time in the history of Canada that there has been a nation-wide rejoicing over no more substantial cause than the fact that a new substitute for something has been made accessible. Eight column headlines on the front pages of all the newspapers. Interviews with the leading clergy, farmers, economists, social service workers of the country—all of them enthusiastic about the great privilege we are about to enjoy in being permitted to consume a substitute for butter and, Mr. President, I draw certain conclusions from these circumstances.

I draw the conclusion that we have entered into the great age of substitutes and that from now on probably most of the reason we shall have for thankfulness and thanksgiving merriment at Christmas and rejoicing at other seasons of the year will be the provision of some new substitute for something we used to have plenty of before but don't have now.

Before I leave oleomargarine and go on to some of our substitutions, may I remark that even the fact we are to enjoy oleomargarine is due to the actions of a substitute for Parliament. Parliament enacted that we shouldn't have oleomargarine, but Parliament didn't disenact that enactment. Oh, no, Parliament goes around the corner back to the Supreme Court and says, "Now we are in a nasty position, will you kindly get us out?"

Substitutes! Substitutes all over the place. Let us take first of all, because this is the good season for it, let us take the subject of the Arts and let us, since this is a musical luncheon, let us think a little about music. Mr. President, the Canadian air is filled with noises transmitted by radio or hurled forth from records, noises which purport to be music but which are really only a substitute for anything that can properly and scientifically be regarded as music. They are not a bad substitute. They are very much like margarine—not a bad substitute if you can get the real thing. But your presence here today, your presence here to listen to these singers and musicians whom we have with us is an evidence that you know the difference between music produced by a human being to be listened to by other human beings with no other intervening mechanism than the waves of the air that exist between the producer and the consumer. That is music. The other things are just substitutes. Nice substitutes, as I say, when you can't get to real music. It is nice to be able to turn a dial and listen to the imitation stuff but it is a substitute, and you know it. If you didn't know it, in spite of the fact I hope you all cheerfully pay your $2.50 license fee for your radio, if you didn't know it you wouldn't be here.

I was reading the newspaper this morning when I sat down to scratch a few notes to shorten up this address which, as I say, started out by being a long address on all the problems of the world, I was reading the newspaper and it occurred to me that the newspapers are greatly affected by this deterioration from the real thing to substitutes. I can remember—a few of us can remember—a few of the members of this audience can remember—a time when newspapers chiefly contained news. I am wrong there. Of course I should say they chiefly contained news and advertisements. What I mean is in the editorial columns they chiefly contained news. Now, Mr. President, half of their space at least is occupied by stuff that I, personally, cannot bring myself to consider as news in any shape, form or quality. Pages, pages of comic strips. Nice comic strips. I study them, I enjoy them. But hang them all—they are not news! Syndicated articles dealing with every conceivable subject except what happened yesterday and what is going to happen tomorrow and at the present moment our two evening newspapers are busy outscooping one another on the Life of the Founder of Christianity, which happened some considerable time ago and cannot therefore be regarded as a matter for current news communication.

And some of the more grievous substitutions—substitutions in which I fear we all have something of a hand—we are developing, I am afraid, a substitute for Patriotism. I don't know what it is. I don't know what to call the masquerade as Patriotism. Oleomargarine is not allowed to masquerade as butter. Some of the others do masquerade as that for which they substitute. I have no doubt oleomargarine would if we allowed it to. I don't know what the substitute for Patriotism does masquerade as. I can remember a time when Canadians wanted their country, their Canada—this is away back in the '90s, when we used to talk about the 20th century as being Canada's century—I can remember when they wanted to talk about their country as being great and powerful and generous to use the power and the greatness that Nature endowed her with for the general good of Humanity. Now, we don't seem to care. The Government doesn't seem to care and most of us don't seem to care very much how small Canada remains, how limited its population is in relation to its size and its natural resources, provided that nobody is allowed into it who might conceivably compete with us in our particular line of industry or business or other effort.

I am a little ashamed to lay much stress on that point today because I am an Editor and I suppose editors are in less danger of immediate competition from immigrants or refugees from Czechoslovakia or Latvia, or displaced persons, we are probably in less danger of immediate competition from them than some of the other occupations which flourish in this Dominion. After all, you have got to be in Canada for a few years before you can do much in the way of writing editorials about it, though I did have a young man in my office the other day who came over on Mr. Drew's scheme and who wanted to start in, not only writing but broadcasting immediately for the benefit of the people of Canada. I thought he was a little premature.

Whatever this substitute is, whatever this new attitude toward our country, this satisfaction with its comparative insignificance, this willingness to have it stay a matter of twelve and a half or thirteen or, if the French-Canadians work very hard at it, a matter of twelve or fifteen million people by our own natural increase, this attitude is so radically different from the attitude that used to exist in this country. It is not, I tell you, Patriotism. Patriotism is a much broader, more generous, more hopeful thinking than anything like that.

One more thing—the hyphen is spreading out into a dash—one more thing and I am through. We are developing, I think, a substitute for work. One of the functions, the primary function of work is to produce things that are needed, but a most important secondary function of work is to maintain the self-respect of the working individual, to make him or her feel that he counts for something, that he is worth more to the community than what he costs the community to keep him alive. Canadians used to feel that they hadn't justified their existence unless they had done a very substantial job of work during their working years. I remember when as a boy I first came to Toronto I was a little shocked by running up against Torontonians who assured me they had never taken a day's holiday in their lives. That, I thought, was unreasonable. That, I thought, was carrying the fashion of work to an unreasonable extent. I even went so far as to suggest perhaps if they had taken a week now and then they might have done better work when they got back from the vacation.

How different are things today! I read the other day that the employees of the Insurance Department of the Province of Saskatchewan were on strike. They were on strike, among other things, for higher wages. I never knew anyone to go on strike for lower wages. As far as that goes, I am all with them. We all want to get all we can for our work. Whether they were entitled to the wages they were getting or were asking, I haven't any idea, but I approve of their demanding more. But, Mr. President, they were also demanding a working week of thirty-seven and a half hours. I sat down to figure out and with a little multiplication I found that there was 168 hours in a week. Supposing that 56 of those hours were devoted to sleep, which I think is plenty in a province like Saskatchewan, with its fine climate. That leaves a matter of 112 working hours in the week. And, My Friends, the employees of the Insurance Department of Saskatchewan don't want to devote more than 35 of those 112 hours to work, because let me point out, while they work or will work if they get it, those 37½ hours in the week when working, they get at least two weeks' vacation with pay and also a certain allowance for illness which in the Civil Service accumulates and then you really have an illness and enjoy yourself. I think on the average they would not work more than 35 hours for their week's pay.

It occurred to me to wonder whether even in the God blessed Province of Saskatchewan where Nature is at times so bountiful and on occasions so unbountiful—I understand they are taking a census of the grasshoppers—

whether 35 hours work in a week or even 37½ hours work in a week at the business of a Civil Service Insurance Department, consisting in the tremendously brain-taxing job and the laborious physical labour of totalling up columns of figures, looking into documents and examining certificates and saying that certificates held by this and that insurance company are adequate to this and that requirement, whether that does constitute the kind of a day's work, the kind of year's work that the Saskatchewan citizen ought to be proud, and then I came to the conclusion that in Saskatchewan and some other parts of Canada and in the Insurance Departments and in some other occupations in Canada there must be developing a new substitute for that function of work, the function of maintaining the self-respect of the individual.

Carlyle—I always like to end with a quotation and Carlyle is a good man to quote from, a 19th century man who did not know anything about our modern conditions—Carlyle did say that all work, even cotton spinning, is noble. Work is alone noble. A life of ease is not for any man nor for any good.

I hope we shan't go too far in this business of substitutes, particularly in the matter of work.

I thank you, Mr. President.

(Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Ladies and Gentlemen, up until a few moments ago I had been prepared to move a very eulogistic vote of thanks to our guest-speaker, when it suddenly occurred to me that we have at our head table today Mr. Napier Moore. Last year on this occasion Mr. Moore was our guest-speaker and his subject was "How to Make a Christmas Speech". I just thought it might be very appropriate if we asked Mr. Moore if he would kindly tender the vote of thanks today and he might perhaps in a few words tell us whether Mr. Sandwell followed any of his rules.

MR. SANDWELL: Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. I was not permitted to say anything about Mr. Napier Moore's speech last year.

MR. NAPIER MOORE: Mr. President, Mr. Sandwell, do you call that the Christmas spirit?

Mr. President, it is quite true that a year ago I did reveal something of the technique of making a Christmas speech. It is likewise true that today's speaker was present on that occasion. But nothing is further from my intent than to insinuate that there is any connection at all between that coincidence and the fact which is so well established over a long period of time: the fact that if, as with fine carpentering, you take a subject and *Sandwell* you get a highly polished result that is very pleasant to the touch.

Mr. Sandwell, on behalf of The Empire Club and the ladies may I express to you what I believe we all feel, and I, too, can spring a quotation. I shall use the line from Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*: "I can no other answer make but thank you, and thanks, forever thanks."

(Applause.)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Mr. Moore, and may I add my personal thanks to you, "B.K." for a wonderful address.

"EUROPE STILL HOLDS THE KEY"

An Address by

JAMES S. DUNCAN, C.M.G.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse.

Thursday, January 6th, 1949

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

Feeling quite certain that the address we are about to hear today would be of intense interest to all Toronto businessmen, we extended an invitation to members of The Canadian Manufacturers Association and The Toronto Board of Trade to join us on this occasion. We are delighted to welcome so many guests who have availed themselves of this opportunity.

Our guest of honour today, Mr. James S. Duncan, President of The Massey-Harris Co., Ltd., has just returned from a seven weeks' trip to Europe. This is only one of several trips to Europe which Mr. Duncan has made since the last war, he therefore speaks from personal knowledge and experience because when he wants to know conditions he believes in going and finding out for himself.

While in Europe recently, he visited eight of the leading countries, and when he was in Rome had the honour of being received in private audience by His Holiness, the Pope.

Mr. Duncan's career with the Massey-Harris Co. is the kind that always makes the headlines. He started in Berlin as office boy in 1910, and was appointed President in 1941. In the intervening years he served in many executive positions, both at home and abroad.

There was one break in his service with Massey-Harris, when in 1914 he enlisted in The Royal Field

Artillery, earned promotion to Captain and was mentioned in despatches, returning to the Company in 1919.

During the past war, Mr. Duncan organized the work of the British Commonwealth Air Training Plan and was made Deputy Minister of National Defence for Air, in recognition for which he was made a Companion of the Order of St. Michael and St. George by His Majesty The King.

In spite of the exacting nature of his many responsibilities, Mr. Duncan still finds time to give generously of his talents to community and national welfare organizations.

Today he has chosen as the title of his address "Europe Still Holds the Key". He sees Europe as still the determining factor in world economy and believes that what is happening in Europe is of greater importance to Canadians than what is happening here at home.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce a member of The Empire Club of whom we may be justly proud, Mr. James S. Duncan, C.M.G.

I am greatly honoured to have been asked to address so many of my fellow citizens under the auspices of The Empire Club of Canada, which was founded in the years gone by to perpetuate and strengthen the ties of Empire, which, in the process of evolution, has now come to be known as the British Commonwealth of Nations, and in which I am personally such a staunch believer and which still embodies the most successful experiment of living together and working together in peace, in harmony and in goodwill which the world has yet devised.

I am glad to see here so many representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Board of Trade, with whom I have had close ties for many years, and from which associations I have derived so much pleasure and satisfaction.

Your Chairman has asked me, Gentlemen, to tell you something of my recent experiences during a 7 weeks' tour of Europe, from which I returned less than two weeks ago. I am doing so all the more readily, because, to my mind, the events which are unfolding themselves over there intimately affect the lives of every Canadian. I will go even further and say that the happenings in Europe today have a greater bearing upon our future as Canadians and our standard of living in this country than our own comings and goings right here in Canada.

I say this because we Canadians, by the very nature of our economy, are peculiarly dependent upon the prosperity and, therefore, the purchasing power of the world as a whole. We cannot prosper in an impoverished world. To be more specific, we cannot prosper if the countries of Western Europe are to be torn by internal strife and if the imminent danger of war is to be an ever-present factor at every conference table.

We are, therefore, vitally interested in the stirring events which are unfolding themselves on the other side of the Atlantic, for it is over there in Western Europe that decisions are being made and action being taken which will decide whether we and our children can live out our lives in peace or whether this distracted world in which we are living is to be plunged once again into the maelstrom of war.

During my recent visit to Europe, I travelled in 8 different countries, the majority of which are recipients of Marshall Aid, and each one of which is struggling with varied success to rebuild its shattered economy. Let me hasten to say that I have been encouraged by what I have seen on this recent trip. I have visited Europe every year since 1944 and have been, therefore, well placed to watch the process of rehabilitation and the year-to-year progress which is being made.

When one considers the degree of physical devastation and economic dislocation which followed upon the war, the feature which surprises one is not so much the difficulties of the present situation, but the rapidity with which many European countries have picked up the threads of their pre-war pattern of life. Had we emerged from this war in a world at peace with its neighbours, as we had fondly hoped; had the fear of aggression been banished from this earth, as we had dreamed it would be; had the world been able to settle down to the rebuilding of its shattered economy with confidence in the future, we would all have been astonished at the resiliency of its economy and the rapidity with which it would have returned to normal.

Now, let me give you a thumbnail sketch of conditions as I saw them in the countries which I visited. Let me hasten to say that, being no economist and no qualified student of world affairs, these impressions may be of little value. They are, however, my own reactions—the reactions of a Canadian businessman to what I have seen over there, and I give them to you for what they are worth.

On the surface, conditions in France appear to be close to normal. The stores are full of merchandise; luxury goods are on sale everywhere; foods and wines are up to pre-war standards and are just as available for those who have money to spend and, from what one could see around, especially in the large centres, there are many people in this category. This is the more so in that Frenchmen, as a whole, have no confidence in the value of their franc and, therefore, the incentive to save, which was one of the pillars of French economy in years gone by, is no longer present.

Below the surface, conditions are less favourable than they appear to be. The civil servants, the teaching classes, and the white-collared workers generally are underpaid in relation to the ever-soaring cost of living, and the net earnings of industrial workers as a whole—and this notwithstanding the recurrent wage increases—are substantially less than in pre-war days. According to official statistics, retail prices are approximately 18 times what they were in 1939, but this is not the whole situation, because all classes of people must resort to the black market to purchase the things which they require, and black market prices are far in excess of official indices. There is no doubt that the most important contributing factor to political unrest in France springs from this unbalance between individual income and cost-of-living.

Farmers and farm labour, on the other hand, are better off than in 1939, and this is an important factor in France's recovery, when one considers that agriculture has always been at the very base of French economy.

Perhaps the most surprising element in the French situation is that a country which is so plagued with political instability, where it seems almost impossible to set up a stable fiscal policy, where so many of the people have little faith in their Government or the ultimate value of their currency, and where discipline, in relation to the payment of taxation, is not all that might be desired, that such a country can yet enjoy such a comparatively high standard of living and continue, if sometimes rather haltingly, its process of recovery from the low point of 1945.

That such a condition is possible is an indication of the basic wealth and economic stability of this country, whose prosperous and self-sufficient agriculture, resourceful people and well-balanced economy have enabled it to maintain a high standard of living throughout generations of political adventures and the bitterness, devastation and sacrifice of two world wars, during which they were occupied twice—once partially and once fully—by their traditional German enemy. And yet France is recovering. Industrially, her production is ahead of 1938, and if the total of her wheat and coarse grain harvested is still 15% below pre-war standards, her agriculture is making rapid progress towards normalcy.

Communism is definitely losing ground in France, and if steps could only be taken, through national self-discipline, to improve the earning power of the masses of the city-dwellers in relation to the cost-of-living, the Communist movement would be even less to be feared than it is at present. Basically, France is not Communistic; the people, as a whole, are too individualistic to rally to this political faith, and many of them who are voting the Communist ticket are but expressing their discontent with existing conditions and their disapproval of the ineffectiveness of the governing body.

Although the De Gaulle Party is making progress, and many who fear Communism are rallying to his support, the general impression which I obtained in France is that he will not be called upon to form a Government. Many think that a solution to the present political impasse is to be looked for in an amendment of the constitution and a reform of the electoral system or proportional vote.

Meanwhile, France is still occupying a key position on the Continent, and her present political weakness is one of the most discouraging factors in the plans which are being drawn up for Western European co-operation and defence. Notwithstanding the confusion of the present situation, I belong to the many friends of France, both within and without her borders, who believe in the ultimate recovery of this great country and the important leadership which it can give once again to the recovery and defence of Western Europe.

I will say but a few words concerning Belgium. We are all acquainted with the remarkable recovery of that stout little nation. The stores are full of merchandise, food is abundant and largely unrationed and agriculture is prosperous. There is, however, a cloud on the horizon, namely that Belgium, which before the war was a country of low costs and where living was very cheap, has now become one of the highest cost countries in Europe. She is losing her tourist trade which was important, and doubts are expressed as to her ability to compete in the world markets, which were the life-blood of her economy, when the period of abnormal demand for goods is no longer with us.

The Communist movement in Belgium is not important and, relatively speaking, her Government is stable.

Holland is another of the small European countries whose territory can be traversed by car with ease in a day's journey, but whose population is but 2,000,000 less than ours here in Canada, a country which suffered immensely from German devastation and occupation. Their war dead amounted to over 250,000, nearly all of them civilians, and out of which 100,000 were Jews. The Dutch are sound, hard working people; they are actively effacing the scars of war; their standard of living is surprisingly high and always has been. They are handicapped economically through the loss of their normal market to Germany, to whom they shipped many of their foodstuffs, and also they are seriously handicapped by the loss of re-sale of the production of their Colonial Empire.

The Dutch are very anti-German. There is a great feeling of bitterness over German occupation—the ruthless handling of the population, the pointless destruction of property, the cruelty to civilian prisoners. They have a reasonably stable middle-of-the-road Government. Communism is no problem. They are against nationalization and are all for free enterprise. They think their Government is spending too much money and many of them are prepared to tighten their belts. As one of my friends said in his inimitable Dutch accent, enlarging upon the fact that before the war he had four servants and now has only one, "We Hollanders must learn to hellup ourselves."

I had not visited Western Germany for two years, and I was greatly impressed by the improvement which has taken place. The railroads are functioning again, roads are repaired, motor vehicles are in evidence everywhere, industrial activity is greatly increased, living conditions have immeasurably improved and the people are looking healthier and are in better spirits.

But it was in devastated cities, such as Cologne and Dusseldorf, that the change was most noticeable. The streets have been cleared of wreckage, houses are being rebuilt here and there among the ruins, stores are re-opening and are reasonably well supplied with goods, a few hotels have been sufficiently repaired for habitation, and restaurants, where tolerably good food and wines and beer are being served, are open for business and are well patronized. In a word, life is gradually returning to these devastated cities and a pattern of rebuilding and reconstruction is emerging. Official statistics confirm this progress.

By the end of August, 1948, the industrial level in Western Germany was back to 67% of the 1936 level.

Currency reforms, which took place last June, have had a very beneficial effect on the economy of the country. Goods which were being hoarded, immediately became available; productivity increased because workers once again had the incentive to earn wages. On the other hand, 94.6% of all bank deposits were lost, and those who had cash savings, or who were unable to invest their monies in goods, saw all but 3.4% of their money wiped out.

Conditions, however, are not as favourable as they were a few months ago, because living costs have been increasing rapidly and people are losing confidence again in the value of their new currency. Wages, which were stabilized throughout the war on 1939 levels, have now been freed, as likewise have been the great majority of price controls. As a result, prices are increasing rapidly and are probably between 50% and 75% higher than 1939, whereas wages have only increased between 13% and 15%. These wage figures for Western Germany are based on personal observation in a small number of industries visited, but are considered to approximate the general level of industrial wages, at least in the British and U.S. Zones of Occupation. There is considerable unemployment in Germany, and everyone who has a job is working hard to hold it, and both the men and trade union leaders are willing to increase the 44-hour week, just as soon as the availability of foreign material makes this possible.

The East-West struggle to secure the allegiance of the German people has, in my opinion, been won largely by the West. The expulsion of Germans from the Eastern Zone to make room for the Poles; the close-up view which Germany has had of Russia under Communism, both as an invader and as an invaded country; the systematic looting of the Eastern Zone; the imposition of a foreign creed; the loss of individual liberty; the nationalization of industry, large and small; the confiscation of land—all this in the Russian Zone of Occupation, have made nonsense of the Russian claim that they are friendly liberators.

There is great bitterness in Germany against Russia, and the fact that the Russians are still holding German prisoners of war and are only releasing those who are ill, and the physical condition of those who return, all add fuel to the fire. Communism is rapidly losing ground in Western Germany, not only in political centres, but in the trade union groups. The 64% vote in favour of Mayor Reuther in the Western Zone of Berlin indicates the trend.

The people in Berlin themselves, in the Western Zone, strongly favour resistance; their morale is high, and the airlift has had a great psychological effect, not only on Germany but beyond its frontiers in all the adjacent and occupied lands. It has been interpreted as a symbol of resistance to aggression. Western Germany applauded the airlift, but like most other peoples, it cannot see how this is a permanent solution to the supplying of Berlin. Some feel that Russia is losing heavily in prestige, and that growing opposition to her policy in the occupied countries may cause her to seek a compromise over the Berlin situation. But this may be but wishful thinking.

Germany looks to the future with more optimism. She finds herself in the desirable position of being courted by both sides. She feels that she is holding a key position and that she has a role to play. One recalls Winston Churchill's comment, "Germans are ever at your throat or at your feet." My experience on this trip has been that they are in a contrite frame of mind. Hitler's war has been a tremendous lesson to them. The cataclysmic evidence of the ruin and devastation which it carried in its wake is all around them and will remain there for a generation or more. I believe that they are genuinely tired of war and want peace and a chance to rebuild and live a normal life. Many of them would welcome an opportunity of entering the Western European Pact; many see in the United States of Europe Germany's only hope for the future.

One of the great problems which is facing the Western Allies is that, having decided to rebuild the economy of Western Germany, it stands to reason that it must be defended or capable of self-defence. One thing is certain, namely, that whatever steps are taken in this direction must be taken under the strictest Western Allies' control. The experience after the last war and the cruel experience of Germany's aggressive policies are such that they will have to prove by their actions that they have had a change of heart and that they can eventually become a sound and reliable partner in Western European co-operation and defense.

I motored over 2,000 kilometres in Italy, starting from Nice on the French Riviera, and proceeding to Rome via Genoa, Pisa and Florence. The Northern Italians are resourceful, intelligent and self-reliant, and the manner in which the roads, the railways and the towns have been reconstructed is quite remarkable.

In cities, such as Rome and Florence, life is back to normal with every appearance of luxury and abundance. Hotels, restaurants, stores, are all well supplied with business. The abundance of butter, white bread, fancy pastry of all kinds, of foods and wines, is really surprising for a country which has lost the war and gone through a revolution.

On the other side of the picture, there are 3,000,000 unemployed who are living in the greatest misery. Many are refugees from the South who have crowded into the big cities and are living in want, degradation and ill health. South of Rome, through Naples and Sicily, the suffering and poverty are extreme. Tuberculosis is prevalent, and there are insufficient hospitals to care for the people who are lying ill in unheated rooms, 6 and 8 persons crowded in together with insufficient food and insufficient clothing. I saw many instances, during a visit which I made to the poorer districts, of families of 6 and 8, sleeping 4 in a bed in the same room, in squalor, disease and in abject poverty.

There has always existed in Italy a great difference between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. Today that difference is accentuated, and this problem, together with Italy's chronic over-population, lies at the base of her political troubles. De Gasperi's Government is showing strength, and the people have confidence that they can handle the situation.

The Communist organization is still strong. Its headquarters are in the Palazzo Dongo in Rome, named after the village where Mussolini was executed, and rumour has it that the Palazzo was renovated with the jewels which were found on Mussolini when he was shot.

Royalist feeling is still in existence in Italy, but it has no present political influence. The Royalists take the view that the Communist problem must be settled first before they devote their attention to any possibility of a return of Royalty. Communism has lost a lot of public support, and people of all parties have shown their understanding of the basic problem by rallying to the support of the present Government as the best means of defeating Communism.

Italian people, as a whole, are not Communistically inclined, and although one cannot over-estimate the strength of the Communist organization in Italy, their largest support comes from those who are dissatisfied with present economic conditions, and there are many, unfortunately, who have a right to feel as they do.

Italian sympathy, generally speaking, is towards Western Europe and the United States. Their army and police together is represented by approximately 300,000 men. They are concerned over their immediate future, because they know that they are not in a position to defend themselves against invasion from Yugoslavia, or from any other source.

Life in the United Kingdom is dull, drab and austere, and the traveller cannot help but contrast conditions in this victorious country with the more abundant life to be found in the majority of the countries on the Continent. Food and many articles of clothing are still rationed; life is strictly regulated; taxation on high incomes is so heavy that in many cases it amounts almost to confiscation. Life is but little easier from the point of view of everyday living than it was during the war, and many people are discouraged and feel that the incentive to work no longer exists.

On the other side of the picture, there is no real poverty in England, and many classes of society are living better today than they did before the war. In contrast to the Continent, there is a tremendous measure of equality of sacrifice, and the rationing system is the envy of Europe. No other system anywhere has insured, as the British system has, regular and equitable distribution of basic foods to all people of all classes at prices within everyone's reach.

As a whole, and notwithstanding what I have said, there is a substantial measure of improvement in the economic conditions of the United Kingdom. Industrial production is approximately 18% above the 1938-1939 level, and agricultural production has increased by over 25% during the same period.

In saying what I am about to say, I recognize that I may be laying myself open to the charge of being prejudiced, because I am a strong believer in free enterprise, the system which has made the greatness and prosperity of this land of ours and of the great country which lies to the south of us; the system upon which the might and the influence of the British Empire were founded. But I endeavour to look upon these matters dispassionately when travelling abroad and, in my opinion at least, I feel that nationalization has not proven its value in the Old Country. To a certain extent, however, the people have accepted the nationalization of railways, of the coal mines, public services and of the Bank of England as "faits accomplis".

They take a very dark view, however, of the nationalization of the steel industry, which is in an entirely different category and which will cut deeply across the whole economic structure of the United Kingdom. It is looked upon as a blow to public confidence. As Churchill put it, "It is a feature in party tactics intended to keep the Socialist left wing as far as possible in order and to keep the Government as long as possible in office".

The Bill contemplates the acquisition of the shares of

107 firms and 250 subsidiaries. It will leave the industry partly nationalized and partly free enterprise, and those which are free, will have to compete against the Government corporation, which will acquire the assets of the nationalized companies below their actual value and will be able to raise funds with Treasury backing on a basis more favourable than those which are not nationalized.

The Government, as I see it, has failed to make a case that nationalized steel will either produce steel in the future in large quantities or at lower cost. There is an overwhelming probability that when it comes to running the steel industry, the State will not be an improvement over private owners. At least, I will say that so far, a satisfactory case has not been made that they could. On the contrary, the arguments have been a matter of political dogma and of assertions which only convinced Socialists would accept.

It is difficult to say what the future holds in store politically for Great Britain. There is unanimity of opinion that the Labour Government is losing in popularity. Whether this means that they would be returned to power with a lesser majority, or whether the Conservative Government would be returned to power with a small majority is anybody's guess. My own opinion is that whichever of these two alternatives proves to be the right one, the problems which the United Kingdom will be facing during the next few years are of such a nature that nothing short of a Coalition Government would have sufficient authority to find a solution to them, but, to my mind, a Coalition Government will only take place after the electors have had an opportunity of expressing their viewpoint.

The United Kingdom's problems, as a whole, are the result of her immense sacrifices during the war and her dependence upon imports for the sustenance of her economy. Some people feel that one of the solutions to her present difficulties is a substantial diminution of her population. I do not know whether this is so, or how it could be accomplished if it were so, but I do feel, however, that notwithstanding the vexatious problems with which the United Kingdom is confronted, she is in many respects the soundest country in Europe today, and my faith in her ultimate recovery is still intact. It is based not on material things, but on things of the spirit, in the character, in the skill and in the self-discipline of her people. Many of the old values are being lost throughout the world, and new and uncertain ones are taking their place, but character, to my mind, is still the greatest asset of any nation and Britain is pre-eminent in this respect.

Now, to come back to the factors which gave rise to the optimism to which I have referred in the earlier part of this address, I would review these briefly as follows:

By their own efforts, which vary greatly in each country, and stimulated by an abundant harvest, and particularly by Marshall Plan Aid, very substantial progress has been made economically all over Western Europe. The living conditions of the people as a whole have improved; industry is making a surprising comeback, which can best be illustrated by the fact that Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom have all exceeded this year the 1937 level of industrial activity, communications by rail, by boat and by air are returning to normal.

Communism is losing some of its public appeal in every country visited. There is no room for complacency here, however, because the Communist organization is still intact in all these countries, and because in many of them, inflation and the hardships which it carries with it are fertile ground for the revival of Communist support.

I noticed everywhere, even in the countries lying closest to Russia, a growing feeling of confidence that the threat of aggression is not an immediate one. This optimism, as I analyze it, is based upon the realization that Western Europe and the United States have emerged from their period of wishful thinking in connection with world peace and are prepared to take suitable measures in order to preserve them, and also that if Russia had intended to start a shooting war, she would have done so this mid-summer during the early stages of the airlift difficulties.

Now in closing, let me sum up the situation as I see it in Europe today. Do not let me give you the impression that I am under-estimating the magnitude of the problems which Europe, yes and the whole world, are facing or that I believe that the battle is already won. I do believe, however, that 1948 has been a substantial year of progress, and that, at long last, both Europe and North America have seen clearly that cessation of hostilities was but the end of a phase of conflict, that our dreams of a complete and untroubled peace were merely wishful thinking and that the battle against a foreign ideology must still be carried on.

I believe that the issues are now clearly understood. We in North America have been slow in discerning them, because we are a peace-loving people, because democracies are slow to be roused, and because we are over-confident and are inclined to feel that other people think as we think. The dangerous period for our cause was the period of optimism and wishful thinking which followed our victory, the period during which, from 1944 to 1948, the United Kingdom reduced her armed forces from 5,000,000 to approximately 846,000, and worse still, the United States from 8,300,000 to 550,000.

Wishful thinking is the real danger, not realism, and if I read the signs correctly, we in North America and in Western Europe have now awakened to the realities of the situation, somewhat late perhaps, but better late than never; and, to my mind, this does not mean a world at war. On the contrary, it means vigilance, resolution, sacrifice, armed preparedness and peace. Peace through armed preparedness, through a balance of military power, is not new in the world; it is almost as old as man, and perhaps we have been foolish to believe that any other solution was possible.

Let us be under no false illusions. The carrying-out of such a policy will mean sacrifice, it may mean even a lowering of our standards of life; it will mean a continuation of our policies of building up the economies of Western Europe, in which we Canadians will have to play our part. It means rearmament and supplying the Western European democracies with the means of defending themselves. It means the continuation of our efforts towards the formation of an United States of Europe, for which the ground-work has been laid, but which can only come into full fruition when it is abundantly evident that this confederation of peoples has not only the will, but the strength to defend itself successfully.

The danger of aggression is still with us. What we have, as I see it, is a period of respite, and the great question which we, the citizens of North America and our Governments, have to ask ourselves is whether we have the moral strength to take full advantage of the days which lie ahead. Weakness and wishful thinking have never prevented any war, and we, the democracies of North America and Western Europe, who believe in peace and yearn for it, should make sure that we are strong enough to defend it.

May my last words be these—that while building up a military strength which will be unassailable, let us hold out once again the hand of friendship to Russia. The people of Russia do not want a war any more than our people do, but dictatorships are prone to adventurous action. Let us remove temptation from their path through the knowledge of our strength and through our determination to defend our way of life and the freedom of our people against aggression.

"WHERE THE IRON CURTAIN FALLS"

AN ADDRESS BY

DONALD FLEMING, K.C., M.P.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, January 13th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

I am sure all right thinking people would agree that the future welfare and prosperity of Canada is dependent on a peaceful settlement of the complex political drama which is being enacted in Europe today.

The political leaders who form the cast in this drama are all skating on very thin ice with the final outcome possibly even more uncertain now than it was a year ago.

We therefore look forward with intense interest to an address from a keen observer who has recently returned from an extended trip in Europe.

Our guest speaker, Mr. Donald M. Fleming, K.C., M.P., was one of the Canadian Delegates to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in London and after an extended tour of the British Isles spent many weeks on the Continent.

While in England, Mr. Fleming was presented to Their Majesties, the King and Queen and met leading members of the British Cabinet and of course the Prime Ministers of the Commonwealth.

He was also presented to the King and Queen of Greece and met the Prime Minister and members of the Greek Cabinet.

While in Scandinavia, Germany, Italy and several other countries he met most of the leading figures in public life, too numerous for me to mention.

Mr. Fleming had a brilliant scholastic career which culminated in him being called to the Bar in 1928. Since then he has devoted much time to public service. In 1938 he served as a member of the Toronto Board of Education and for the next 6 years was Alderman for Ward 9, during which time he was Chairman of many committees and gave generously of his talents in the interests of Public Welfare.

In 1945 he was elected to Parliament for Toronto-Eglinton, where his natural brilliance and sincerity resulted in him being a candidate for the leadership of the Conservative Party at the National Convention in October last.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce another member of The Empire Club of whom we are very proud, Mr. Donald M. Fleming, K.C., M.P., who has chosen as his subject—

"WHERE THE IRON CURTAIN FALLS".

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I count myself honoured indeed by the invitation received from our President to address my Fellow Members of The Empire Club. I cannot forget that I am speaking before a Toronto group and therefore I must report to you on two compliments that I think were very high compliments indeed, extended to our city.

Your President has referred to the fact that I had the very great privilege of being presented, along with the other delegates to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, to Their Majesties at Buckingham Palace. I had the great privilege of a short chat with Her Majesty and a short chat with His Majesty also, at the conclusion of the formal reception. His Majesty's first question was, "Well, how did the Exhibition get on this year?" I told him with some pride it had the greatest success from many points of view, including attendance, it had ever enjoyed. He said he had received glowing reports from his cousin, Earl Mountbatten, on his return to England after opening the Exhibition.

When speaking to Her Majesty, when she learned I was from Toronto, quick as a flash she said, "Oh, that was the city where they had the wonderful arrangement for our reception on our Tour in 1939. Wasn't that the city where they had the big platform in front of the City Hall with all the decorations?"

Again it was with pride, as a Torontonian, that I was able to tell Her Majesty that was the place.

After an absence of two months during which one saw many changing signs and had enough interesting experiences to fill ten or twenty normal years of one's lifetime, it is indeed difficult to compress within the space allotted on an occasion of this kind impressions that must necessarily be of general import.

I want to say just a word, however, concerning the Conference itself. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference was probably the most largely attended, the most carefully planned Conference of the kind that had been held throughout the long and useful history of the Empire Parliamentary Association. Representatives were present there from no fewer than thirty-seven parliaments all over the Empire. Representation was not confined to the parliaments of the self-governing dominions, but the colonial legislatures were represented as well. The discussions were exceedingly interesting. The deputations from the various countries within the Commonwealth and Empire contained some very interesting figures—not least of all, perhaps, the delegates from India, of whom there were fifteen, including many men now distinguished in the public life of India, and I may say most of whom being followers of Gandhi had had prison terms in their fight for independence.

I wish to say this concerning them, and I made it my business to get intimately acquainted with as many of them as possible: in no case did I find the slightest trace of bitterness. On the contrary, their attitude was one of whole-hearted gratitude to Britain for the gift of independence and an assertion of their determination to prove themselves worthy of the gift of self-government. They said this, too, that Gandhi insisted there should be no bitterness toward Britain, that what he was fighting was what he called "the system" that he objected to, but certainly not Britain.

I should like to pause to make one comment on an interesting speech made by one of the delegates from Pakistan. He happened to be the Hindu leader of the Oppositon in the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan. You are aware, of course, that at this conference there were representatives of every colour, almost all the races of the globe, and almost every creed as well as almost every political party. We were rebuked by the delegates from Pakistan for calling ourselves "white men" in distinguishing ourselves from those we perhaps unthinkingly choose to call "coloured people". He said, "There is no such thing as a white man. The only white man is a ghost. You people who call yourselves white people are in reality pink".

Now, he may have been accurate enough in his remarks as applied to some of the delegates present. I will say no more about that.

There have been important changes occurring in the Commonwealth in these very recent months. Profound changes have taken place. Eire and Burma have left us. India, Pakistan and Ceylon are now self-governing nations. India has not yet finally settled her course with reference to her relationship to the Commonwealth but it appears that even if she does choose to become a republic, a question which is being weighed now in the meetings of the Constituent Assembly in New Delhi, she will seek some close relationship with the Commonwealth and for the sake of the world peace and stability in Asia it is to be devoutly hoped that she will.

It is not possible I think to give a categorical statement on this subject of recovery in Europe. Undoubtedly, Western Europe is recovering, but the degree of economic and political recovery varies greatly as among different countries. Italy is sharing in the recovery although she still has two million unemployed. I may say of the countries of Western Europe, Italy is the only country today that has a surplus of labour. In every other country you find the governments crying for more labour. There is a great dearth of labour in the Scandinavian countries and for that reason I don't believe there is very much hope of immigration to Canada from those countries on any substantial scale.

This fact, however, stands out crystal clear: with the exceptions, to which I will devote a little more time later on in my remarks, the tide of Communism in Western Europe is receding. It has substantially receded in the last two years. That is the experience that one encounters in all the countries of Western Europe with two exceptions that I wish to mention.

We are hearing a great deal these days on the subject of Western Union and the Atlantic Pact and I was particularly interested to see in this morning's newspaper a comment concerning the attitude of Sweden toward adherence to the Atlantic Pact or indeed to a Scandinavian Agreement of mutual defence. I made a good many enquiries on this subject in Sweden as well as in Norway and Denmark. Undoubtedly, while there is high hope held for the Western Pact in many countries, we are not going to convince the people of Scandinavia and in particular the Swedes who have come through two wars as neutrals, that they can pin their hopes for defence and peace on the Western Pact unless there is more stable support for the ideas of the Western Pact in France.

I spoke about exceptions to the picture and it is partly because of the able and masterly way in which somewhat the same ground in the countries of Northwestern Europe was covered last week in the address we listened to from Mr. James Duncan that I wish to concentrate my remarks in particular on two situations that were not covered in his trip to Europe. I want to speak particularly about Greece and Berlin.

I had five days in Greece, along with a small party of Canadians—I think six in all—at the end of October. They were five memorable days there and the scenes which I saw there I think are permanently impressed on my memory. I can never forget many of the things I saw in Greece.

Greece is a country at war. Let no man think that is any mere civil war in Greece. What the Greek people are fighting against today is Communist invasion. And this comes at a time when the people are war weary, after eight years of war. The day after we arrived in Greece, the 28th of October, Greece celebrated a national event, known as "ONI Day", the anniversary of that day, the 28th of October, 1940, when the courageous people stood firm and said "No" to Mussolini's ultimatum that they should submit to the occupation of the country by the Italian Army and occupation of the Greek ports by the Italian Navy.

The end of the war with Germany found that nation literally on the verge of starvation. A whole nation had been reduced by the rigours and cruelties of the German occupation to the verge of starvation.

It is a great thing to be a Canadian and go into Greece because it was Canadian wheat arriving just in the nick of time which literally saved that nation from starvation and there is no limit to the gratitude that the Greek people entertain toward Canadians.

It was the same thing everywhere one went. We visited various centers which are operating with equipment furnished by Canadian funds, either the Aid-to-Greece Fund or the Red Cross. We saw chest examination clinics, child clinics, prenatal clinics. We saw the outstanding Cancer Institute, just outside Athens,—all of which were cleaned out of all equipment by the Germans in their withdrawal—an old German habit—and which were re-equipped in their entirety with equipment from Canada, supplied from Canadian funds. Canada's prestige is almost incredibly high in Greece. There is no nation which commands more good will on the part of the Greek people than does our nation.

I want to pay tribute to the excellent work which is being done in Greece by the Canadian Ambassador, General LaFleche. He has seen to it that when Canadian help is going to Greece the recipients of that help have known it came from Canada.

Well, I haven't time to dwell further on the subject of Canada's prestige or the gratitude of the Greek people, except to say that when the car of the Canadian Ambassador drives through the streets of Athens flying the Red Ensign, it is met with cheers from the people on the streets. When our party went to the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Athens to lay a wreath, a crowd gathered around very quickly, in a few minutes, and when it was made known we were Canadians the crowd cheered and cheered. This is more than the same people always receive in Canada.

I feel it my duty to say a word about the way in which this war is being carried on by the aggressors. When they have been operating in force they have operated from bases in the Communist countries immediately north of the Greek border, principally Yugoslavia and Albania, and to some extent, Bulgaria. There have been incursions into Greece in force. You remember, about a year ago a large scale battle was fought in the Grammss Mountains. We were quite close to the scene of battle during our tour of the relief areas in the north of Greece. It was hoped at that time that the Government forces would be strong enough to surround that invading army and to cut off the retreat but fighting conditions in Greece are almost incredibly difficult. The country is completely mountainous. It is ideal country for guerillas to operate in, and the government forces weren't strong enough to cut off the retreat, and the guerillas made good their escape on that occasion.

But I would not wish to give the impression that Communist aggression is confined to the north of Greece, because literally there are Communist guerilla bands operating all over Greece. They are even down in the south, Peloponnesus, all over the country.

Naturally, one asked, how on earth are these bands being equipped? Where are they getting their arms and ammunition? because they are well equipped.

The answer I was given by a very high source in Greece was that they are receiving their arms and ammunition and equipment from Russian planes flying over from the countries north of the border at night.

Appeal has been made for assistance in the form of night fighters to the Western Nations, principally the United States, but up to the time when we were there the request had not been complied with.

I am sure that all here today are familiar with the despicable tactics of these Communist guerillas. They raid in bands of varying size. They swoop down on the villages. they give the men of the villages their choice of being shot or conscripted into the ranks of the guerillas. The young women are carried off. The children are abducted and sent to the countries north of the border to be brought up there in Communist schools, to be filled with hatred, in the hope that those children will be prepared, when old enough, to go back and fight against their fatherland with a view to overturning the Government in the country and setting up a Communist Government. Over 13,000 Greek children have thus been stolen from their parents by these guerilla raiders.

You ask me how I know. I tell you I received that on very high authority and I believe the authority from which it comes. As to the numbers, I can't say I counted those children, but I will say when I was in Paris and attended the meeting of the Political Committee of the United Nations Assembly there, if you please, I heard the Yugoslav delegate and other delegates representing the Communist satellite countries complaining very bitterly about Trygve Lie banning under United Nations auspices of a Yugoslav film depicting what that delegate described as "the happy conditions under which Greek children are being schooled in Yugoslavia".

Well, what they can carry off in goods they carry off. What they can't carry off they burn. The homes they burn. Over half of the homes in the villages of Greece have been destroyed. In a nation of little more than seven million souls, over 700,000 of those people are refugees today, driven out of their homes. One out of every ten persons in Greece is a refugee from his home today.

Translate that into Canadian terms, gentlemen, and think what it would mean to Canada if she had come out of this recent war in an utterly exhausted condition, if they were a very poor country in addition, and if one-tenth of her population were driven out of their homes and were refugees and a charge on a poverty-stricken state.

Of course the Communists particularly love to indulge their hatred of religion and one doesn't go very far without receiving reports of many of the atrocities that have been committed on priests in that country. There are many reports that one receives of crucifixions of priests with the complete enactment of all the details of the Crucifixion of our Saviour. There was one case where a young girl was kneeling at prayer before a shrine when the Communists descended upon the village and to exhibit their hatred of things religious they cut off her legs at the knees.

There are many dark aspects of the Greek picture. The refugees are living under almost incredible conditions. I am not giving you anything in this respect second-hand, because several of us were flown up to the north of Greece to see first hand the conditions under which the refugees are living and we spent a good deal of time one day driving throughout the country seeing these refugees. Here is a group of refugees living in tents—children running about barefoot and shabbily clothed, women in shabby clothes, many of them, barefooted. I go into a tent, 18 feet by 35 or 40 feet, at the very most, and I ask how many people are living here. The answer is 55.

I go into Yannina, a city in normal times with a population of 22,000, on top of whom 25,000 refugees have been placed there by the Government. I saw as many as seven people living in a small room. How they can all sleep at the same time I don't know, because there isn't room for seven people to lie down together. We saw many a case of a whole family having their best meal of the day on a pot of beans or a pot of onions. A very lucky family got out with a bag of grain. An occasional family got out with a goat or a calf or a couple of hens, but most of the refugees were driven out of their homes with nothing more than was on their backs and perhaps an odd blanket.

The relief appropriation is six cents per person per day. They are not living on that—they are starving on it.

I would not have you think that starvation is anything new in Greece because the standard of living in many parts of Greece is very, very low. I visited an area just outside Piraeus, settled by refugees driven out of Asia Minor by the Turks in 1921 and 1922—small places, one room each, usually. These little houses or hovels accommodated one family or, in some cases, two families, ridden with tuberculosis in many cases, as the refugees are in the north of Greece. Tuberculosis is on the increase all the time and rickets is prevalent among the children. We were there while people were at their main meal of the day. The main meal of the day in Greece is eaten at noon. There we saw them at their main meal which consisted of bread and olives. We wandered up and down the alleyways separating these little houses. I heard sounds of grief coming from one quarter and I made it my business to follow those sounds to their source. I found myself standing outside one of the houses at the open window looking in on a gathering of many women and children who were sitting in a circle in stony silence while in the centre two women in an hysterical condition were weeping over the body of a little girl, a ten-year-old girl who had died that morning of tuberculosis. I asked about her family. She was one of ten children and the other nine children were all suffering from tuberculosis.

My Friends, there isn't anything I can say that adequately bespeaks my admiration for the Greek people in the heroic fight they are making against overwhelming odds. I have a most profound admiration for the heroism of those people and as a Canadian I have a sense of obligation to that nation, to its modern inhabitants, when I recollect what the Western World owes to that nation, the cradle of Democracy; and when one appreciates the strategic position which Greece holds in the Eastern Mediterranean and how much it would mean to the designs of the Communist aggressors, bent upon world revolution, if they could swing Greece behind the iron curtain, I have no hesitation in saying that it is the obligation of those of us who enjoy the priceless benefits of Freedom and Democracy in this Western World to have some regard to our obligations to those people and do all we can, at least materially, to come to their succour and rescue.

If Greece should fall behind the Iron Curtain, just think for one minute what it would mean in the Eastern Mediterranean. That would put Russia alongside the Dardanelles. Russia has been demanding a voice in the control of the Dardanelles for years. How long does any one of us think that the Turkish Republic could stand up to Russian pressure if Turkey were isolated in the Eastern Mediterranean, and if Turkey were compelled to compromise with Russia, what stands then between Russia and the Suez but Palestine, and if the use of the Suez should be neutralized, then, my friends, the whole balance of power in the world shifts and it will affect the course of history, not merely for us but for our children and our children's children.

Greece would have been Communized had it not been for the presence of British troops, landing there on the heels of the withdrawing Germans. Greece was the one country in the Balkans into which either the British or Americans got any troops and that leads me to say something, though an amateur in these matters, a confessed amateur, about the subject of strategy. Many of you have seen the recent book published by General Eisenhower in which he deals with this question of the Allied strategy in the assault upon Europe. You remember, Mr. Churchill held out in conferences with Mr. Roosevelt for an attack through what he called the "soft under-belly of Europe". Churchill knew the Russians so well and with that vision that has characterized so many things that he has said and done, he foresaw clearly that unless the

Western powers made some landings in the Balkans, the Communists would seize control of the resistance movement in all of the Balkan countries as they did, and Russian troops of occupation would be in there, and the free governments of those countries would be overthrown and Communist dictators set up in their place.

Well, as you know, the Americans were not prepared to give in to Mr. Churchill's point of view in this respect. Apparently, General Eisenhower felt the Americans could not use their heavy military equipment to the best advantage in a Balkan campaign and he advised Roosevelt in favour of the assault on Western Europe.

Wherever the merits of that discussion may lie, the fact of the matter is that what Mr. Churchill foresaw happened, precisely, in all the Balkan countries, with the exception of Greece, and Greece would have gone Communist, as the Prime Minister, Mr. Sophoulis, told us while there, if it had not been for the presence of General Scobie and the force of British troops in Greece. Britain got troops into Greece on the heels of the Germans. The Communists were the only people in the country who had arms and they were set to strike; as a matter of fact, feeling thwarted in the execution of their plans, they did strike, and you remember British troops actually had to participate in the suppression of the armed outbreaks on the part of the Communists. There was bitter and bloody fighting around Athens itself and you can see the marks of it today.

I wish to speak about Berlin. It is hard to conceive a more interesting place on the face of the earth today for anyone interested in public affairs than Berlin. I arrived in Berlin about the middle of November. Berlin, due to the wisdom or the lack of foresight on the part of the Western leaders is an island, a little island in a sea of the Russian Zone of Occupation. The nearest point in the British zone to Berlin is 130 miles away. Berlin was divided into four sectors: Russian on the east, American on the southwest, British in the middle west, and the French on the northwest. Of course, arbitrary division of a large city along those lines results in all kinds if anomalies. For instance, the Russian War Memorial is in the British sector. The Berlin radio station over which Goebbels used to broadcast his propaganda is in the British Sector, and is occupied by the Russians. They are staying there and they have made it clear they are staying there until they are forced out, and the suspicion is if they are forced out the Russians will cut off all the power to the western sectors because their power outside of small generating plants comes from the Russian sector.

Berlin is a city of ruin. It is impossible to conceive the scale and extent of the desolation within that city without seeing it. I am told a greater weight of bombs was dropped on Berlin than on all the British Isles. One can believe it as one travels mile after mile through that city seeing little but ruin. An unharmed building is a rare exception. A building that is partly usable is the exception. Ruin and rubble stand everywhere.

When I commented to some of the officials in the Control Commissions whom I met that I couldn't see much indication of clearing even of rubble, they chided me and said, "You should have seen this place when we we came in. The streets were filled with mountains of rubble." Well, the streets have, for the most part, been cleared of rubble, but the buildings have not. The only clearing of rubble in Berlin today is carried on by women by hand. There are no trucks or bulldozers available for that purpose. One wonders in amazement how four and a quarter millions of people can find places to live in that city. Four and a quarter million people! The answer is that they are living in the cellars of the ruins of the buildings—in the cellars because the ability of that city to accommodate people in any place but the cellars has been almost completely destroyed. One official in the British Control Commission in charge of Housing, told me they have succeeded in providing in repaired form 40,000 housing units since they began operations. I listened to that statement with amazement because it is so hard to see the physical evidence of it.

There is a great shortage of goods in Berlin, a great shortage of needed goods. I spent some hours wandering up and down what is left of the shops in the main shopping district in Berlin. The people are very stern looking. One doesn't see any smiles. One doesn't hear any laughter in Berlin. The shops where one would go to look for clothing have practically nothing to offer. The chauffeur from the Canadian Military Mission, my guide on that shopping tour, told me his sister had had a pair of shoes on order for a year and a half, and was still waiting for them. We passed one shop where a small consignment of shoes had just arrived. There was a long queue in front of the shop. We looked at one women's dress shop—they had two dresses in the whole shop and it probably is the best women's dress shop in Berlin.

I haven't time to talk about currency troubles, except to say since the recent reform of currency in Berlin there has been a substantial reduction in black market operations. When we were there Westmark was worth about 33 cents. The Russians do not permit circulation of the Westmark in the Russian sector, and you have been reading about the steps taken to check more closely the entry of workmen in the Russian sector to see where they are committing the offence of carrying the Westmark issued under the Allied Control authorities on their persons.

The Airlift has been a thrilling success. The Airlift unquestionably is the greatest triumph of organization and execution in the history of aviation. Even in the war the degree of organization that exists in connection with the Airlift today was at no time attained. The Airlift is possible only because there are two air fields in the Western sectors in Berlin—Templehof Airport in the American sector and Gatow Airport in the British sector. Gatow hasn't the buildings that Templehof has. Templehof has fine buildings but the runways are on the short side for the great craft being used as cargo planes in the Airlift. At both air fields I saw the Airlift in operation and I had the inestimable privilege of being in the control tower at Gatow Airport and seeing the management and organization of the whole area as far as the R.A.F. is concerned. On each of those air fields when the Airlift is operating at capacity—and it does operate at capacity as far as weather conditions permit—one of the four-engine craft is landing every three minutes carrying a load of seven or eight tons. They taxi to a stop, a ten-ton truck rolls up, the plane is unloaded and off again in the air inside of forty minutes. There is a plane leaving each of these air fields every three minutes. That means there is a landing or a departure from that air field every minute and a half and it is all directed by one man. The aircraft are coming in, flying at four different altitudes, four strata, because of the varying makes and speeds of the planes, and one man directs the approach and landing of those planes.

If there is any disturbance in the schedule of landing that schedule is so tight that the planes whose schedule is affected by the upset must return to the base from which they came without landing.

I said the Airlift has been a success. Well, the Russians never expected when they imposed the land blockade last June in the hope of driving the Western Powers out of Berlin that the Western Powers could supply between two and a quarter and two and a half million Berliners in the Western Sectors with what they required in the way of food. The Airlift has made possible the maintenance of the food ration in the Western Sectors. As a matter of fact it was slightly increased in the fall, very slightly. The ration isn't very large today. It averages 1800 to 1900 calories per person per day.

Fuel is a different story. Fuel has been coming in but by reason of bulk the Western control authorities had not been able at the time I was there to promise the Berlin people in the Western Sectors more than 50 pounds of coal per person for this winter.

Likewise there is a developing shortage of raw materials which has compelled the curtailment of industrial operations in many factories in Berlin. Already, when I was there, there were 90,000 unemployed in the Western Sectors and the number was increasing all the time.

Gentlemen, the Airlift is a very costly operation—very costly. And it apparently gives our erstwhile Russian Allies a great deal of satisfaction that the Western Powers should be compelled, in order to provide food and fuel and means of employment for the Berliners in the Western Sectors, to be put to this expense and hazard.

Well, they are trying to supplement that fuel ration by cutting down every second tree in the streets of the Western Sectors this year and I saw many people while I was there out in what is left of the Tiergarten and Grünwalt out gathering twigs, little bits of twigs. I saw people coming in with their arms full of twigs, the kind of twigs that might provide a flame for ten or fifteen minutes, or at the most, twenty minutes. Such is their desperation.

Now, I had the opportunity of conferring with two of the leading Berlin political figures while I was there—Dr. Fredensberg, then the Acting Mayor in Berlin, the head of the Christian Democratic Party, and Dr. Ernst Reuther, the head of the Social Democratic Party, the party which scored such a resounding success at the polls on the first Sunday in December. Both of these men foretold very confidently the result of the forthcoming municipal elections and they said this, too, that if the Russians would permit the holding of elections in the Russian Sector it would show precisely the same resounding defeat for the Communists as in the Western Sectors.

I was interested in finding the reasons. One reason was the treatment meted out to Berliners, principally Berlin women, by Russian soldiers in the early weeks after the defeat of the Germans by the Russians. The other thing was the Airlift. What an amazing thing this world is! There are those British and American—not Canadian—planes, flying over the Russian Zone into Berlin, carrying food and fuel to those Berlin people. They are the harbingers of mercy today—the planes whose arrival was execrated by those same Berliners only three and a half years ago.

The stiffening of the morale of not only the Berlin people but the German people in general against both the blandishments and the incursions of Communism is attributable to the Airlift because they see at last clear evidence of both the power and the determination on the part of Britain and the United States to stand up to the Russians, and the effect of that on the morale of the Germans is simply incalculable.

Not only that, but the Airlift operation is well known behind the Iron Curtain and I was assured by those Berliners that not simply in the Russian zone of Germany east of Berlin but in the other countries living in blackness behind the Iron Curtain today they see in the Airlift the strength of their hopes that some day they may recover their freedom.

The Airlift must be continued. To abandon the Airlift today would be clear intimation, not only to Berlin, not only to Germans in the Russian Zone but to those people behind the Iron Curtain—yes, and to those nations west of the Iron Curtain who stand next on the list for the visitation of Communist aggression, that they are being thrown on the mercy of Russian Communism. That is what it would mean. That is what the abandonment of the Airlift Operation would mean in Europe today and I think it means much to Canadians, not simply the people who live in Western Europe, that Central and Western Europe should not be thrown to the wolves of Communism.

There are two questions I shall endeavour to answer just briefly. The first question I am asked is this: Will The Airlift Continue or will the Western Powers be compelled to attempt to force the blockade? All I can say to you is that I had it on high authority that there was a disposition to attempt to force the blockade when it was first imposed, but that the Governments of the United States and Britain were not prepared to attempt it. Personally, I don't think that under present conditions an attempt is going to be made to force the blockade by land. I think under present conditions at least for a considerable period of time the Airlift will be continued. It will have to be continued and every effort made to expand it.

The other question is this: Is war coming? Many people were asking those questions in Britain when we were there in October. Will the cold war in Berlin become a shooting war? The British, American and French officials to whom I put that question had no firm opinion to express on it. They said, "Perhaps we are not in the best position to judge. Perhaps we are so close to this picture that we can't see the woods for the trees. However, we know if war is coming there is nothing we can do to prevent it, so day by day we are concentrating on making the greatest success of the Airlift that can be made."

My own conclusion, for what it is worth is there will be no war at present. The Russian people certainly would not want war, though they would not be consulted about it. For the present, the Communists, in keeping with their schemes of world revolution, apparently plan in Northwestern Europe to do everything they can, short of war, to weaken the Western nations.

What does this mean for us? I think it means for Canadians, just as it means for Americans or British, that in no way can we do so much to prevent war as by strengthening ourselves militarily and economically.

(Applause.)

The thanks of the Club to Mr. Fleming was expressed by Mr. Kingsley Graham.

"THE NEW INDIA"

AN ADDRESS BY

THE HONOURABLE SARDAR HARDIT SINGH MALIK, C.I.E., O.B.E., I.C.S.

Chairman: The Third Vice-President, Mr. Sydney Hermant

Thursday, January 20th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

It is our privilege to-day to hear the Honourable Sardar H. S. Malik, India's High Commissioner to Canada.

Born in the Punjab, Mr. Malik was educated at Eastbourne College, England, and Balliol College, Oxford. Mr. Malik went to France from Oxford in 1916, and served with the French Army on the Western Front. In 1917 he transferred to the Royal Flying Corps as a fighter pilot, and saw service in France and Italy. He was wounded in air combat over France in 1917.

After the War Mr. Malik entered the Indian Civil Service and served in the Punjab until 1930. He was then appointed Deputy Trade Commissioner for India in England. In 1938 Mr. Malik came to New York as India's first Trade Commissioner to the United States and Canada.

Mr. Malik came to Canada as India's High Commissioner in 1947.

The Empire Club of Canada extends a special welcome to a loyal and true servant of the Empire, and it affords me great pleasure to introduce the Honourable Sardar Hardit Singh Malik, C.I.E., O.B.E., I.C.S., who is going to address us on the subject of "The New India".

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, Members of The Empire Club:

I am most grateful for your kind invitation and for your kind hospitality, and also for this opportunity of meeting so many distinguished gentlemen, and of telling you something of India and our people.

Before I tell you about what is happening in India, I would just like to start off by saying that ever since I first came to North America in 1938 I have been very conscious of the friendliness and the great interest that is taken in my country, an interest that has been very greatly enhanced since India became a self-governing Dominion in 1947.

The knowledge about India is sometimes not quite up to the friendliness and the interest, and I would like to relate to you a couple of personal experiences which took place in the United States, but might quite easily also have happened in Canada.

Soon after we arrived in New York, my wife and I were taken to dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel and, during the course of the dinner, I noticed that there was very considerable interest being taken in our little party by the people sitting fairly close to us at another table, and I had the feeling that there was something in the air, that before the evening closed there would be some kind of an incident.

Sure enough, as we were having our coffee, one of the girls came up from this table, walked over rather uncertainly to our table and made straight for us. When I saw she was coming to us I got up and she said, "May I sit down?" I said, "By all means", and brought up a chair. She sat down and looked earnestly at me across tht table and said, "Can you tell me what is going to happen to me?"

Another experience we had very soon after that: We went down to Pinehurst in North Carolina. I am very fond of golf and was taking a little holiday and I entered for the Tournament there known as The North and South. In New York we had received a great deal of publicity because it was the first occasion on which the Government of India had sent their own representative to the United States, and our pictures were in the papers, in the movies, and so on. We got a little tired of it, so when we got to Pinehurst we were relieved to see that there was no publicity of any kind whatsoever. We never saw newspaper men. We were quite happy. But on the second day we were there we were dining with some old friends and the nurse after dinner came up with a local paper and she said to my wife, "Mrs. Malik, have you seen what is written about your husband in the paper?" She hadn't, nor had I. She produced the paper and there was an article about me and this is how it ran:

"By far the most interesting entry in The North and South Tournament is that of the swarthy swell from India—Mr. H. S. Malik. It is rumoured that he has ninety wives. On this occasion he showed up, however, with only one".

I was very puzzled and I said to my friend, George Dunlap, "George, this puzzles me, because I have not met any newspaper men and I don't know any of them here."

He said, "I know the writer of that. Would you like to meet him?"

So he arranged for me to meet the writer the next day. I said to him, "I don't know where you got this story from. Of course, it is inaccurate because I have only one wife. But I hope you realize you are paying me a great compliment because I have neither the constitution nor the financial means!"

I am not saying that everybody in Canada thinks I am a fortune teller, but one occasionally comes across people who still think along those lines!

Well, I propose to tell you today what our experience has been since we gained our independence, what the position is in India today, and I also would like to give you some idea of the plan that we have for the future and perhaps a word or two about our conception of our place among the nations of the world.

We looked forward with very great anticipation to the day when India would become a self-governing Dominion because, whatever be the merits or demerits of the old system under which India was ruled from Whitehall, in India it certainly left a feeling and a sense of being cramped. Our people generally felt that they were not at liberty to plan the future of their country. It was with tremendous anticipation therefore that we looked forward to the day when we could develop our country along the lines that we feel it should be developed so that we could attain within the shortest possible time that position of dignity and of influence among the great nations of the world which we feel is India's destiny.

I say we looked forward to this day with great anticipation and joy. When the day came, there was joy—no doubt about that—but there was at the same time a great sense of frustration and great apprehension regarding the future because our independence was accompanied by the partitioning of India into two countries—India and Pakistan—and you know, because it is comparatively recent history, the terrible tragedy that followed the partition of India, the ghastly communal violence that broke out a little before and subsequently, and the terrible peril that we faced, of India being plunged into civil war.

There was violence on a very large scale in Pakistan and in Northern India, and the danger then was that the same kind of disorder and violence would spread throughout the whole country.

You must remember that the basic cause for this violence was the hatred and religious intolerance that had been preached for some years before. The partition of India was based on the claim that the Moslems in India were not content to live in a democratic state under a majority rule. And in the preaching of this thesis religious fanaticism was deliberately excited for political ends.

Our problem then, when we got millions of our people running away from Pakistan because of what was happening to them there, was a most difficult one. When they came to India and told the terrible tale of their suffering, there was intense resentment, and there was a general demand throughout the country that the people in India—the non-Moslems (Hindus and Sikhs)—should rise against the Moslems still in India—and we had at that time and still have forty to forty-five million Moslems scattered throughout India in groups, and the danger was that the majority community would pounce upon these minorities and mete out to them the same treatment which had been meted out to our people in Pakistan.

It was at this time that our greatest peril existed, because if this thing had gone through and if retaliation had materialized and had been allowed to go into effect, India would certainly have been plunged into civil war, not for a few months or a few years, but for many years to come. In fact, India could not have survived. It was then that the greatness of that wonderful man, Mahatma Gandhi, came into play, because he, having lived throughout his life for the principle of love and toleration and peace, and humanity, was grief-stricken when he saw the state that his country was falling into and he decided immediately on desperate measures. He went, personally, to the worst affected areas, the country where the danger was greatest and he exposed his life a thousand times. He begged the people in the parts where the situation was most threatening; he begged them all to be human beings not beasts or worse than beasts and he, small and weak physically, though he was—and he always refused to be escorted or protected in any way—succeeded in achieving this miracle, even among communities of young men, angry men, who at that time, as you read, saw nothing except the need for retaliation, and these young men and women fell at his feet. They came up there with their guns and tommy guns and swore they would give up this madness and violence.

The Government, our new, young Government, under the inspiring leadership of that very great man, inspired by his example and teaching, worked and succeeded in preventing the spread of communal violence.

When Mahatma Gandhi, himself, was assassinated in January, 1948, then we really touched rock bottom so far as despair and hope was concerned. For a time the whole of India was numbed. People did not know what to do. I wasn't there myself but I have been told by people who were in India that, immediately after his assassination, the radio kept repeating every five minutes, "Mahatma Gandhi has been assassinated", and people really didn't know which way to turn. Then the Government realized and the people generally throughout India realized that, if the violence which was then prevalent could lead to this, that a man who was worshipped and venerated and loved throughout the country was struck down by one of our own people, then we were on the verge of madness. That tragic event was therefore a tremendous shock to the people of India.

The Government of India had the wisdom and statesmanship to seize that opportunity to take the strongest possible measures against such elements in the country as subscribed still to violence and to make it quite clear that they would not tolerate attacks on the Moslem community in India.

In other words, we did set out to establish, once and for all, the principle that India was a secular state in which men and women of all religions and all races and all creeds—Hindus, Moslems, Sikhs, Christians—were equal in the eyes of the law. They were all the citizens of India, all protected by the state, and all entitled to live as citizens without any discrimination against any community whatsoever.

It was a tremendous thing at that particular time to attempt to do. But the Government of India won through on this. It was nothing short of a miracle. Anyone who knows the conditions in India and, as I have just said, in the face of the gospel of religious fanaticism that had been preached by Mr. Jinnah on which he had built up Pakistan, will realize what a tremendous achievement it was, and up to a short time ago we still were apprehensive about the situation.

Then something happened which made the victory of the Government complete and final in this field, and that was the case of the Hyderabad State. Hyderabad State is largely Hindu by population, but it is ruled by a Moslem ruler. Hyderabad had fallen into the hands of a gang of wild communalists and a small minority in that State had seized power and were inflicting the greatest cruelty on the majority of the population. The Hindus were running away from Hyderabad, and the danger was that the whole of India might flare up once again. The Government of India asked the Nizam of Hyderabad to control the situation, but he was powerless to do so. Then they went in, and, as you know, within four or five days the problem of Hyderabad was settled. Peace, law and order was established. The gangsters who had dominated the rulers of Hyderabad, in whose hands they were helpless, were driven out and the Nizam of Hyderabad assured that as soon as things were normal again the people of Hyderabad would be called upon to decide about the future relationship of Hyderabad with India.

I say that was the final test, because the danger according to some people then was that the whole of India would be plunged into bloodshed and chaos, because the Moslems of India would resent a Moslem ruler being treated that way.

What happened? Not a single case of any communal disorder at any time. The Moslems realized what the situation was, and came out and supported the action of the Government of India.

That was the most gratifying thing that could happen. It convinced us that we had succeeded, once and for all, in establishing the principle that India as constituted today was for all its people—Hindus, Sikhs, Moslems, Christians, everyone — all with equal rights and equal privileges.

Now, the second great peril that faced us at that time was the Indian Princely States. We had almost six hundred of these States and in practically all of them there prevailed political systems that were feudal or semi-feudal. All power was vested in one single individual, the Prince.

In India, on the other hand, we had established a system of representative or democratic government. The danger was that some of the more powerful states like Kashmir, Hyderabad, Baroda, etc., might try to establish themselves as independent entities. Now, if that had happened, India would have split up, not into two countries, but into twenty-five or thirty countries, and India's future would have been bleak.

The Government of India were determined to maintain the integral unity of the country, and they handled this very, very difficult and complicated problem in this way: They turned to the Princes and said: We don't wish to interfere with your personal position within your states in any way, except that you must recognize the current that is now running in the affairs of this country and you must establish within your states popular democratic forms of government; and secondly, having done that, the people in each state must decide whether that state will join India or join Pakistan. But they guaranteed to the Princes, provided they fell in with the general demands as advanced by the Government of India as representing the demands of the country as a whole, that if they did that, then their position as constitutional heads of their states would be guaranteed. Within a year this question has been solved. There are either in being today or about to be established in the states, systems of government that are popular, democratic and representative, and every state has either merged with the adjoining province or has formed itself along with other states into large enough groups and joined India or Pakistan.

These two achievements within a year are capital achievements by our Government, and please remember that this great work has been performed at a time of unusual difficulty. In the first instance, as a result of the partition we lost a great many of our experienced British Officers in the Civil Services and in the Armed Forces, almost overnight, and then we lost a great many able, experienced Moslem Officers who left for Pakistan.

In addition to that, the Government of India inherited a situation of severe economic crisis. Shortage of food was of proportions that amounted almost to a famine. There was a shortage of everything—clothes, housing, all the material needs by man, and there was also the ever-present threat of inflation. And, as I have just said, these two great problems, these difficulties that faced us and that threatened our very existence, had to be met at a time by a young and inexperienced government, when they had these other difficulties to face.

The position in India today is that, instead of the chaos and the confusion that threatened us only a year back, we have law and order, peace, throughout the length and breadth of India, and the Government of India are going ahead in various fields of nation building and nation development of which I shall give you a few details.

Another great problem that has been with us ever since partition and is still with us is the problem of our relations with our neighbour, Pakistan. We started off, as you can naturally expect, in great bitterness—bitterness on both sides. Then to make everything worse, when we were attempting to resolve our difficulties, there came the Kashmir problem. I am happy to say there has been a steady improvement in the relations between our two countries. We have had a number of inter-Dominion conferences at which almost every outstanding issue has been satisfactorily settled. The only outstanding item of any importance now is the question of Kashmir, and as you have read in the papers recently, both India and Pakistan have received the praise and the congratulations of the entire world on the agreement—the preliminary agreement—that they have reached as a result of the efforts of the Security Council. In fact, this gesture made by India and Pakistan has been held out as an example to the other nations who, instead of supporting the Security Council and the United Nations, are acting in a way to lower their prestige and to make people feel generally that the United Nations is just a washout.

Now, I come to some of the plans that we have regarding the future. I would describe them in one word. That is: our aim is to improve the living conditions of our people. India is a great country in natural resources, but she has a vast population and the great masses of the people live in very, very poor conditions, both of food, of clothing and of housing.

Education, as you must know, is limited to only about fifteen per cent of our people.

Our health standards are deplorably low. The natural resources of our country have not been developed industrially, except just on the fringe.

Our agriculture today is pretty poor, compared to the potential of our great land, and our Government are determined that in all these fields of nation building, work shall go on, not one thing after another but simultaneously, so that India may reach her greatest development within as short a time as possible.

I will give a few instances of the kind of work that is being tackled. Take, first of all, our Agriculture. As I said, it is in a very poor condition today. Our schemes contemplate the reclaiming of vast areas of land that today are not cultivated. The figures came through only the day before yesterday and I will quote them because they are interesting.

Under the reclamation scheme, six million acres of land that can easily be cultivated, but is not at present, will be brought under cultivation. The expenditure is calculated at $300,000,000, part of which will be spent on the necessary equipment which we hope to obtain in North America, the United States and Canada, and partly in Great Britain.

Another field closely allied to agriculture is the development of water power. India has a great area under cultivation but it is calculated that we are using only five per cent of our water power. We have great rivers, but in the past the waters have been allowed mostly to run to the sea. They have done great damage on the way, through periodic floods. The Government have under way—some of the works are under construction, others under planning — the contemplated harnessing of the waters of these great rivers, so that vast new areas of land shall be brought under irrigation and made to produce food for our people. Today we are importing grain. It seems ridiculous, but we are.

At the same time we propose to develop hydro-electric power. We are going in for multi-purpose schemes on the model of the T.V.A. Our present hydro-electric power is half a million kilowatts. These schemes contemplate the production of fourteen million kilowatts and, when India has achieved that, she will rank third among the nations in hydro-electric power—The United States, the U.S.S.R., and India. The potential from this source is calculated at forty million kilowatts.

As a result of this development we look forward to the establishment of new industry and the extension of our existing industries. All this is being done because we are convinced that, with the tremendous population that we have in India, the only way to achieve any real improvement in the living conditions of our people is to develop both agriculture and industry.

While developing our great industries we are not forgetting what has been the traditional industry of India, that is the beautiful handicrafts and the cottage industries, and it is interesting to note that the Government of India have established a special Board of Experts whose responsibility it will be to see that everything possible is done, not only to maintain the existing handicrafts and cottage industries but to develop them by giving every possible support and help.

These are some of the achievements in the economic field. As to our future Constitution, I would like to say a word in passing and briefly mention the Constitution now being worked on by our Constituent Assembly, a fully sovereign body. The principle behind that is that, as I have just said, all the people of India shall be treated equally, with no discrimination against any religion or caste or creed. The removal of untouchability—that great slur on our national life has been removed within a very short time of the Government coming into power, and that one action, I claim, is symbolic of the tremendous change that has taken place in India in this very short time. It is eloquent of the public support enjoyed by our Government that they have been able to go ahead with a measure which was considered so revolutionary that no government in the past has dared even to touch it.

The Constitution provides for a fully democratic, representative system of government, with representative, responsible governments at the centre and in the provinces, and representative assemblies elected on the basis of adult franchise.

In the social field I have already referred to untouchability, which is the greatest social reform. In other fields, in the condition of women, what would have been considered revolutionary changes have been made. The whole status of women has been changed. Women now will have the right to inherit along with men. Polygamy is being abolished. Rules have been laid down that women, when they perfom the same type of work as men, shall have the same wage and, as you know, India is the only country in the world with a woman in the Central Cabinet a woman as Governor of a great province, and a woman as Ambassador—and all three are doing marvellous work in their own fields.

I haven't time to go into details regarding the various steps the Government has taken, but let me assure you, whatever field of national life or national activity you look into you will find that India is on the march. We are going through a dynamic period and every department of government is busy on the great plans for the future of India.

Our great Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru, is an internationalist in the true sense of the word. He has a very keen sense of the relationship between the different nations and different parts of the world, and he declared the very moment he assumed office that India would, in accordance with her great traditions, play a part in bringing about peace and understanding among the different nations of the world. She was not prepared to align herself with any group but she would work in her own way, comparatively impotent as she was at present, for international peace and understanding, both in and outside the United Nations. We will continue to play our part, and those of you who have attended international conferences will, I hope, agree that our delegations have made themselves felt at these meetings.

There has been a very important departure so far as India's participation in world affairs is concerned. As you have seen, there is a meeting in New Delhi this month of the Asiatic countries, Australia and New Zealand, called by our Prime Minister in order to help the United Nations to settle the Indonesian question. In tackling that question in its latest phase the Security Council had come up against great difficulties, and our Prime Minister felt that it was up to us and the countries of the East to take some united step, always within the framework of the United Nations, to help the Security Council take the step necessary in settling this extremely difficult issue, an issue considered very fundamental by all the people of Asia. It is a very interesting lead that India has given, and I think it is symbolic of the part that India feels is her responsibility in international affairs.

The reason for that is very simple: We are convinced there can be no understanding, no permanent peace until the disparity between the living conditions of the Western part of the world and the living conditions of the East is removed. We feel that is the only way of avoiding those violent movements that threaten the whole existence of Humanity. We are working to that end in India. All our efforts are directed towards an improvement of the working conditions of the masses. We feel throughout the Asian world a similar effort must be made, that it cannot be made under the system of the old-day Imperial Colonialism, which some of the countries are still clinging to but Great Britain had the wisdom to abandon when she left India.

We feel that one of the ways the threat to the peace of the world can be met is by bringing prosperity to these people. We believe the Western democratic system can bring about that improvement and happiness if there is a sufficient understanding in these Western countries, the powerful countries, of the needs and aspirations of the people of Asia. Just as Pandit Nehru is playing a great part today, there are other leaders in Asia who have the same aims and ambitions, who are deserving of our sympathy, our support and our understanding.

My own personal opinion is that India is placed in a unique position today. She is very conscious of the great heritage that has come to her over the thousands of years. She is conscious of the fact that India gave to the world a great system of moral philosophy, great culture, great science in its own day. We are at the same time very conscious of the tremendous benefits that have been brought to the world by the progress of Science, by industrial civilization, and this consciousness, of course, has come to us through our long association with Great Britain. During that assocation we have learned to love and admire the great liberal traditions that the British people stand for, the traditions of human freedom and democracy, and we have learned to appreciate the great benefits that modern civilization, with the great material advance, the great scientific progress, has brought and can bring to Humanity.

India provides, therefore, what I might term a synthesis between the old world and the new, and I think it is within that synthesis that future peace, contentment and understanding can be achieved.

(Applause.)

At the request of the Vice-President, Major Vincent Price thanked the speaker on behalf of The Empire Club.

"YOUR HYDRO CHAIRMAN REPORTS"

AN ADDRESS BY

ROBERT H. SAUNDERS, C.B.E., K.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, January 27th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

This is one of the those occasions when it seems superfluous for me to spend more than a few moments in introducing our guest of honour, because Mr. Robert H. Saunders needs no introduction to any gathering of Toronto businessmen.

However, just for the records, which, as you know are published in our Year Book, I feel I should mention a few of the highlights in Mr. Saunders' career.

He was born and educated in Toronto and graduated from Law School in 1928.

After practicing law for some years he entered Civic politics, was elected Alderman for Ward 4 in 1935 and served in that capacity for several years.

In 1941 he was elected to the Board of Control and remained on the Board until 1945, when he ran for Mayor and was elected by a large majority.

Mr. Saunders was re-elected by acclamation in 1946 and was returned to office in 1947 and 1948 with record majorities.

On March 1, 1948, Mr. Saunders resigned his office as Mayor and accepted the appointment of Chairman of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario.

In the light of subsequent events we know that he took over this important assignment at a critical time in the history of our vast Hydro Electric system.

The necessity for curtailment of electric power both in industry and for domestic consumption brought Ontario very close to a serious state of emergency and the new chairman of The Hydro Commission was confronted with a tremendous public relations job, which I think we are all agreed he has handled with courage and great credit to himself.

Then, in answer to everybody's prayer that we be delivered from further blackouts, the heavens opened and the rains came down in time to avoid a more serious crisis.

Today Mr. Saunders is going to bring us up-to-date on the Hydro situation and doubtless give us some forecast regarding the future outlook, which I think is embraced in his subject "Your Hydro Chairman Reports."

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Robert H. Saunders, C.B.E., K.C.

Mr. President and Gentlemen: I appreciate sincerely the opportunity that you have given me to report to the members of our distinguished club. It was just ten months ago I was privileged to stand in this place and make my first public statement as the Chairman of the Hydro Commission. Much has happened since that day. We at Hydro have really had our troubles—I was almost going to say "much water has passed under the bridge since we last met"—that would be treading on very dangerous ground. In fact, the water was just not there to pass under any bridge. We are thankful to a beneficent providence for sending rain and dropping it in the right places. I should, I believe, refer somewhat more in detail to our troubles during last fall.

Looking at our overall picture in Southern Ontario—some 60% of our power comes to us from plants located on continuous flow rivers, the Niagara and the St. Lawrence (through our purchases from Beauharnois). These plants, of course, are not affected by lack of rainfall. The other 40% of our resources are generated on rivers with variable flows by our Commission and our Quebec suppliers. Unfortunately the sharp and sustained increase in demand coincided during the fall of last year with a period of marked and probably unprecedented deficiency in rainfall and consequent river flow over a wide area of Ontario and Quebec and in the area supplying 40% of our power. This lack of rainfall caused in November last, a reduction of approximately 45% in the deliveries from plants supplying that 40% of our power. The result—a reduction in the Commission's resources of over 17% below their normal dependable capacity.

Let us examine a few actual facts on the question of shortage—

CHATS FALLS (Ottawa River)

	Generation K.W.H.	Inflow C.F.S.
Wednesday, January 26, 1949	2,155,600	24,971
October 21, 1948	1,484,200	17,315

Deficiency due to lack of water 671,400 K.W.H.

BARRETT CHUTE (Madawaska River)

	Generation K.W.H.	Inflow C.F.S.
January 26, 1949	976,400	3,049
October 29, 1948	247,800	1,031

Deficiency due to lack of water 728,600 K.W.H.

HEELEY FALLS (Trent River)

	Generation K.W.H.	Inflow C.F.S.
Wednesday, January 26, 1949	276,340	4,723
October 21, 1948	190,160	1,720

Deficiency due to lack of water 86,180 K.W.H.

Total Deficiency due to lack of water 1,486,180 K.W.H.

These are a few examples of the effect of not sufficient rainfall in our own plants. What about our suppliers on rivers of variable flow?—

Our contracts call for the delivery of 28,160,000 Kilowatthours per week from the Gatineau Company and

16,385,000 Kilowatthours per week from the MacLaren-Quebec Company or a total from the two Companies of 44,545,000 K.W.H. per week. During the week ended November 16th, 1947, when the supply of water was favourable, we were able to purchase 31,464,200 K.W.H. from the Gatineau Company (3,304,200 above contract). During that same week in 1947, we were able to purchase from the MacLaren Company 20,468,000 K.W.H. (4,083,-000 above contract), a total of 51,932,200 K.W.H. That was in 1947. What a change in 1948! During the week ended November 14th, 1948, we were only able to purchase from Gatineau 11,743,800 K.W.H. and from MacLaren's 10,836,000 K.W.H.—a total of 22,579,800 K.W.H.—21,965,000 K.W.H. less than the contractual figure—29,352,000 K.W.H. less than 1947—sufficient to take care of Toronto's present load for almost 6 days of the week. Why were these Companies short? Let me quote in part a letter received from the Gatineau Power Company dated September 14, 1948—

> "Confirming my conversation with Mr. Hambley this morning, we have to advise that we must further reduce our deliveries of power by 7,000,000 K.W.H. per week in view of the existing water levels in our storage reservoir. The situation becomes more and more critical each day the present takings are continued."

That, gentlemen, was the second letter making a total cut of 8,000,000 K.W.H. We did not then know it but there were two more letters still to come from Gatineau and one from MacLarens.

Those were certainly hectic days at Hydro. But such was the picture last fall in Southern Ontario.

We at Hydro endeavoured throughout to give the people actual facts. It was extremely difficult to gauge the future. Last October the Winter picture looked awfully grim, I assure you. Entering November there was no improvement. Why, on November 3rd we were forced to cut our direct "at-will" and "interruptible" customers by 2,729,490 K.W.H. That day, a Wednesday, we were only able to generate and purchase a total of 28,281,100 K.W.H. Compare that with 34,323,400 K.W.H. just one week ago to-day. Then the rains came and with the rains came increased power. The Gatineau Company was able to deliver more power. In October and the first part of November that Company was delivering 14,000,000 K.W.H. under contract—to-day its deliveries are some 6,500,000 K.W.H. under contract.

We at Hydro felt that it was our duty to give the people the benefit of every extra K.W.H. We increased Municipal quotas as often as it was possible. We endeavoured to give our people as much encouragement as was possible and within reasonable limits. No man can prophesy very far into the future. In mid-December we were able to prophesy to the end of the year. The weather continued mild and the rain fell in the right places. Toward the end of the year we were able to prophesy to the end of January. Now we are able to say that the present deliveries to the Municipalities can continue throughout the Winter. This means that if we, and our Municipalities, continue to receive the same measure of co-operation from our people as at present there need be no more cut-offs this Winter. Generally across Southern Ontario we are able to carry the load over a six day and six night period. There may be Municipalities whose special circumstances such as a heavy industrial load, make this impossible but generally across the area we are able to carry the load over six days and six nights.

So much for the power picture. What about construction? The preparations that have been made for to-day's and future loads?

On March 25 last, I told you that I was very proud of my association with these men of Hydro. Today, with almost a year's experience I can repeat that statement with great emphasis. We, as citizens of this Province, can feel very proud of the men who have been and are in charge of the local Hydro Commissions and Public Utilities. Also of the men who have had charge of the Provincial Hydro —your own Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario The Honourable George H. Challies, Ross Strike, K.C., R. L. (Dick) Hearn, our General Manager and Chief Engineer, Otto Holden, Bud Manby—yes, I could go on and on. They have done a wonderful job. For proof just look back over the past few years.

As we all know, during the war all essential materials and manpower were marshalled for Canada's all-out war effort—and rightly so—Additions to generating plants and construction of new generating plants were permitted only under Government control and allowed only when they could make an immediate contribution to the war effort. The capital construction budget tells the story.

In 1941 the estimate was $23,884,000. The construction forces were only able to spend $20,725,000 or 86.8%.
In 1942 the estimate was $18,989,000. They were only able to spend $15,664,000 or 82.5%.
In 1943 the estimate was $11,974,000. They were only able to spend $9,787,000 or 81.7%.
In 1944 the estimate was $8,808,000. They spent $6,582,000 or 74.7%.
In 1945 the estimate was $11,780,000. They spent $8,927,000 or 75.8%.

Unable to build, your Hydro Commission prepared for the future. The staffs prepared plans for post-war developments. Once war was over your Commission acted with amazing speed. On August 23, 1945, just 8 days after the Japanese surrender, an order was given to proceed with the immediate construction of the second unit at its DeCew Falls Plant near St. Catharines. (That new unit was opened in and has been operating since September, 1947). On September 20, 1945, just 36 days after the surrender of Japan, the Commission also commenced operations at its Stewartville Site on the Madawaska. (That Plant with its capacity of 60,000 k.w. (80,000 H.P.) is now operating. It was opened last fall). Yes, since the war, your Hydro Commission has been pressing forward with the greatest construction program in its history. With the direct object of meeting the power demands of today and of the future and fulfilling its proper role in the future development of every section of this Province.

In addition to the DeCew and Stewartville Plants, Hydro has completed a new Unit at Ear Falls and a new plant at Aguasabon, both in the North West section of the Province. It has put into operation the Frequency Changer and Transformer Station at Westminster (near London) to take care of the steam power from Polymer and future power from the new steam plant about to be built in Windsor. In addition, wonderful progress has been made at Des Joachims, on the Ottawa; Chenaux, on the Ottawa; the Tunnel project on the Missasagi and Pine Portage on the Nipigon. Survey work is being done at the LaCave site on the Ottawa. Let the financial picture tell the story since the war.

In 1946, the capital construction estimates were $32,363,166. There was still a shortage of men and materials. Our men were only able to spend $20,045,858 or 61.6%.

In 1947 the estimate was increased to $57,386,507. Our men were able to spend $46,094,835 or 80.3%.

Last year was the first year during the war and post-war periods when we were able to spend our budget.

The budget was $83,219,772—we spent $90,202,374. Yes, over 109% of the budget.

Since I last spoke to you, we have been spending on construction alone, well over $8,000,000 each month or over $262,722 each and every day including Sunday. Your Hydro, gentlemen, is forging ahead in spite of the shortage of men and materials. Speaking of men and materials, did you ever stop and realize the extent of our need?

At our Des Joachims Plant on the Ottawa, there are about 2,500 men working winter and summer. Right today and every day during the winter, regardless of weather, we are using over 7 carloads of cement. In the spring this will increase to 10 carloads each day. Remember—on this one job.

On that job we shall pour 185,000 tons of concrete, just 26 times as much as was used in constructing this building (the Royal York). Something like 46 times as much as was required for the Canadian Bank of Commerce Building, acclaimed as the highest in the Empire. Yes, about 95 times as much as was used in constructing the Bank of Montreal Building at King and Bay Streets. 185,000 tons at Des Joachims; 90,000 tons of concrete at Pine Portage; 80,000 at LaCave—I could go on and on. Not only do we need cement but also almost every other type of material including an abundance of steel. Just imagine between October, 1947, and October, 1948, Hydro constructed 342 miles of high tension line, over 3,500 miles of rural line, and many many other works.

So much for the past. What of the present and the future?—Hydro today and has been for the past year, distributing the available power to all our citizens as equitably as possible. We believe that in the interests of the Province, we could not refuse new customers. Because of this stand many new homes have been built in our cities. Many factories have been built and the farmers have been encouraged as they should be, to stay on the farm. It was suggested that our rural program should be held up. Your Hydro Commission decided against this view.

To bring you up to date on the rural picture in Ontario, I should like to point out that from November 1, 1947, to December 17, 1948, 3,973 miles of new line were constructed and 29,965 new rural consumers given service. During the 1948-1949 fiscal year which includes that period from November 1, 1948, our program calls for the construction of 3,868 miles of line and the provision of service to 38,756 new consumers in the rural areas. The total number of all rural installations to date is approximately 220,000, consisting of 90,000 farms and 130,000 non-farms. When our 1949 program has been completed, this number will be increased to approximately 259,000, consisting of 106,000 farms and 153,000 non-farms.

An interesting feature is that at the end of 1948, the estimated percentage of the total number of farms in Ontario enjoying rural service was 53%, while this percentage will be increased by the end of 1949 to 62%.

When thinking of these extensions, let us all please realize that the increased load last year because of rural extensions was only about 23,000 H.P. against an increase caused by new construction in urban centres of well over 113,000 H.P. We shall continue to distribute the available power to all as equitably as possible. Only in this way will we not stifle progress in this Province.

Looking at the future, a load increase of approximately 100,000 kilowatts per year is anticipated. It is our hope that by bringing in small packaged steam units and diesel plants, together with purchases from the Detroit-Edison Company, to have sufficient power to take care of the load increase this year. We have already made definite arrangements for an extra 63,000 kilowatts by the fall of this year. Negotiations are now underway which will, we believe, increase that figure to 70,000 kilowatts (93,000 H.P.). For example at Hamilton different plants, 18,000 kilowatts. At Thorold, 15,000 kilowatts. At the Site of our Scarborough Frequency Changer Station, another 20,000 kilowatts. At Chatham, 10,000 kilowatts, and so on. In 1950, we expect at least one section of the Des Joachims Ottawa River Development will come into operation and possibly the whole 480,000 H.P. In 1951 the Chenaux Development on the Ottawa River will bring an additional 120,000 Horsepower and the Windsor Steam Plant at least 160,000 H.P. In 1952, the LaCave Development on the Ottawa River will bring in another 200,000 Horsepower. We contemplate and hope that permission will be given for the greater and more efficient use of the waters of the Niagara River which will give us another 400,000 to 500,000 Horsepower. We contemplate construction of a steam unit at Hamilton, Toronto or both. The ultimate size will depend to some extent on the outcome of the negotiations regarding the Niagara River and our prospects for the St. Lawrence. I think we all realize that the greatest single need for the future welfare of this Province is the development of the St. Lawrence. Here we have water flowing in great quantities, twenty-four hours of every day during the whole year—precious water to this Province and to the people of the United States which today is being wasted. We must, however, prepare for the future. We must obtain a sufficient reserve of energy to attract industry to this Province and to this Country and in looking to the future, the power of the St. Lawrence or its equivalent must be obtained. If not from the St. Lawrence, then we shall be obliged to go into the construction of additional steam plants. This of course, we have no desire to do because of the greatly increased costs involved but for the protection of our people, the power must be obtained. Our share of the St. Lawrence will give an average of some 6,000,000,000 kilowatthours per year. It is estimated that about one pound of coal would be required for each kilowatt hour or a total of 6,000,000,000 pounds. 3,000,000, tons annually, (one of the largest private electrical companies on the continent today uses 1.1 pounds per kilowatthour). On present estimates, the cost of power delivered at the power site on the St. Lawrence would be 2.6 mills per kilowatthour at 80 per cent load factor. On the other hand, the cost of generating steam power based on present prices and at 80 per cent load factor is estimated to be 7.7 mills at the plant. In other words, the St. Lawrence River project would, if completed, give us power at some 5.1 mills less per kilowatthour than steam units—or at about one third the price of steam.

Gentlemen of The Empire Club and visitors, let us please remember that there is no one single factor that contributes more to the community and industrial unity of this great Province than an efficient and well administered Hydro. We can readily visualize the hundreds of thousands of our people in homes throughout the rural and urban areas of this Province who commenced their way of life this morning with the use of electric power provided by Hydro. Whether it be the washing machine, the refrigerator, the milking machine, or just the lights themselves. We can further visualize the thousands and thousands of workmen who today passed through the open portals of the rapidly increasing industrial plants of this Province to engage in their individual daily work as related to their way of life. The plants are open, industry is virile—made possible by electric power, created by your Ontario Hydro.

(Applause.)

"CANADIAN IMMIGRATION POLICY"

An Address By

HUGH LLEWELLYN KEENLEYSIDE,
M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, February 3rd, 1949

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

During the last few months I have read one or two articles dealing with the food situation, in which the writer forecast that at the present rate of increase in population, accompanied by a decrease in the productivity of the soil, the world would be over-populated in the not too distant future.

Personally, I have every confidence that the ingenuity of man will meet that situation when the time comes. However, this thought led me to a contemplation of the distribution of the population of the world at large and this is what I find.

The population, per square mile, of some of our neighbours, is as follows:

Japan	- 496
China	- 105
India	- 246
Soviet Union	- 21
United States	- 45
Great Britain	- 507
Canada	- 3½ - and exclusive of the Territories, 5

as per Canada Year Book - 1947.

These are significant figures, gentlemen, which tell their own story and bring into focus a problem which in my humble judgment should be outside the realm of politics—is it not a matter of self preservation?

It is therefore with great interest that today we welcome as our guest speaker, Dr. Hugh L. Keenleyside, Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, the title of whose address will be "Canadian Immigration Policy."

Dr. Keenleyside was born in Toronto but received his education in British Columbia, where he graduated from the University of British Columbia in 1920. He had a brilliant scholastic career and spent some time as a lecturer at his Alma Mater.

In 1928 he entered the Department of External Affairs and went to the Canadian Legation in Tokyo as First Secretary; he remained in Japan until 1936.

In 1941 he became Assistant Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs and in 1944 he went to Mexico as Canadian Ambassador.

Returning to Canada in 1947, Dr. Keenleyside received his present appointment.

He has served on numerous international Councils and Commissions, and is the author of two books.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Dr. H. L. Keenleyside, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S.

There has recently been a good deal of public discussion in Canada about the role of the civil servant in our governmental system. As a member of the federal public service, therefore, I should like to preface what I shall say by a brief definition of the terms on which I appear before you. My views as to the duty of the civil servant may be summarized as follows:

> Before the Government decides on a specific policy or a particular course of action, it is the duty of the officials of the departments or agencies concerned to advise the Minister or the Government and to recommend the course of action which they consider most likely to be of general public benefit.
>
> This advice may or may not be accepted; the recommendation may or may not be adopted. *The decision is not the responsibility of the civil servant but of the Minister or the Government.*

When a policy has been adopted it is the duty of the civil servant to carry out that policy, within the limits of his particular function, to the best of his ability. He should not publicly criticize the Government's policy; nor should he give it public praise. In response to enquiries or on other appropriate occasions he should describe, define or clarify the policy if that is part of the duty of his post. Otherwise he should confine himself to the anonymous and efficient execution of that part of the policy that has been assigned to him.

It is within the bounds of this definition of the proper duty of a civil servant that I shall now proceed to the discussion of *Canadian Immigration Policy.*

II.

In view of the reputation of the people of my natal city for piety and propriety, it would, I believe, be advisable to start with a text. Fortunately such a text is readily at hand. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 1st of May, 1947, the then Prime Minister, the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, gave a clear and specific definition of the policy of his Government in relation to immigration. Mr. King's statement can be summarized in the following terms:

First: Canada needs population and the national growth can be stimulated by an active immigration policy. The number of immigrants, however, must be related to the absorptive capacity of the country.

Second: There is no intention of allowing mass immigration to make a fundamental change in the character of the Canadian population. In consequence, Asiatic immigrants must continue to be barred except in certain particular cases. At the same time the Canadian Government will be prepared to enter into special arrangements with any country "for the control of the admission of immigrants on a basis of complete equality and reciprocity."

Third: During the depression and the war, immigration was inevitably restricted; now the categories of admissible persons have been considerably widened. Special steps will also be taken to provide for the admission of carefully selected immigrants from among the Displaced Persons of Europe.

Before proceeding to a discussion of each of these points I should say a word about the legal basis of the immigration policy.

Immigration into Canada is controlled by the terms of the Immigration Act, and of the Regulations made in accordance with the provisions of that Act. The Act does not guarantee to anyone the right of admission *as an immigrant*. This is a privilege, not a right. On the other hand, the Act does define certain prohibited classes, including persons suffering from some forms of mental or physical ailment, criminals, advocates of the use of force or violence against organized government, spies, illiterates and others. *Persons within these prohibited classes cannot be admitted to Canada as immigrants except by Act of Parliament*

I have said that the Immigration Act does not define the classes or categories of persons who are admissible to Canada as immigrants. That definition is to be found in the Regulations made under the Act by Order-in-Council. To place such a list in the text of the Act itself would make exceptions impossible, save by legislation, and thus render the whole administration so inflexible as to be practically unworkable. In view of the fact that most of the persons who are inadmissible are placed in that category by Order-in-Council, the Government may, of course, provide at its discretion, also by Order-in-Council, for the entry of such persons. This action is taken frequently—usually on humanitarian grounds.

This is the legal framework within which the immigration policy is carried into effect.

III.

Let us now return to the three headings under which I have summarized Mr. King's description of Canadian Immigration policy. The first summary was:

> *Canada needs population and the national growth can be stimulated by an active immigration policy. The number of immigrants, however, must be related to the absorptive capacity of the country.*

There are two major considerations that support the belief that an increased population for Canada is desirable. The first is defence—not only, or even primarily, military defence but rather the defence of moral justification and intellectual and social independence. If Canada is to be secure in the retention of its rich and varied heritage, if it is to justify this retention on either practical or ethical grounds, a larger population is essential. But it is necessary to provide a defence not only against the moral condemnation of less favored nations, and not only against the possibilities of external aggression, but also against the loss of the Canadian identity in the larger American community through a more extreme disparity in size between Canada and our great southern neighbour. Canada is Canadian, not American. In spite of our friendship and admiration for the United States, we believe that Canadian life has values of its own which would be lost by absorption in the great Republic.

Another reason for the fostering of immigration is the effect that a larger population would have in reducing the burden of our transportation system and our other facilities which geographic and political factors have expanded and which sparsity of population has kept uneconomic. The Canadian railway network for instance could serve a population much larger than that of today. The same thing is true of our broadcasting installations and other facilities for communication. An enlarged population would erase deficits, or at worst, make them easier to carry. The same argument might be applied to the weight of our political institutions. The present number of legislatures, and even of civil servants (!), could undoubtedly service a larger community.

But the Prime Minister also said that the number of immigrants admitted to Canada should be closely related to the absorptive capacity of this country. What is that absorptive capacity. That is a 64 thousand dollar question!

To the naive and impulsive observer the problem of Canadian immigration is a relatively simple matter. His conclusions are based directly on the ratio between area and population.

Canada has a land area of 3 and one-half million square miles; it has a population of approximately 13 million persons. The ratio is about three persons to the square mile. On the other hand the United Kingdom has a population of 507 persons to the square mile. Adapting the British ratio to the Canadian area (with allowance for the Arctic and sub-Arctic regions) Canada "should" have a population well in the hundreds of millions. Therefore, any official policy that aims at anything much less than this is uninspired, if not actively obstructive! This kind of argument is simple, easy to understand and has an appealing logic. But it also requires a simple mind to accept it. The land-population ratio is certainly one factor in the definition of absorptive capacity, but it is a factor of relatively minor importance.

It would be physically possible to put fifty million people into Western Canada. It is conceivable that by adopting intensive methods and relying upon subsistence agriculture this number of people might be kept alive. But this kind of oriental over-population must, of necessity, be accompanied by an oriental standard of living—*so long as agriculture is the basis of the economy*. We can have fifty million people between Winnipeg and Vancouver—if we are content to have these people living like the peasantry of the more depressed parts of China.

In trying to define the absorptive capacity of Canada there are factors of much greater importance than the mere superficial area of the country. Among these are the nature, distribution, availability, and marketability of our natural resources. Under efficient modern methods of cultivation it takes about 320 acres of average wheat land to provide a decent living for a Canadian family. A mine covering a tenth of that area might provide incomes for a thousand families not to mention all those engaged in the subsidiary services that would be required to meet their domestic and public needs.

A second factor is the knowledge of effective techniques of extraction, processing, and distribution. New processes are constantly being developed (often by scientists in the service of the federal and provincial governments) which enable Canadians successfully to exploit mineral and other resources that would otherwise lie idle. The tar sands of the Mackenzie Valley are a case in point. Here science will one day provide an economic solution which will make available what is probably the largest oil reserve in the world.

The existence of large accumulations of capital available for investment is another important factor in the development of the Canadian domain and consequently in the absorptive capacity of the nation. The existence of a resource, the availability of labour, the technical knowledge required for its development, will not alone suffice. Capital is also essential. In the case of the phenomenal iron deposits of Labrador, for example, something over 100 million dollars will have to be spent before a single ton of ore is shipped to the smelters.

Finally, reference should be made to a fourth factor which because of its effect on the processes of internal development has a significant influence on the absorptive capacity of the nation. This last factor is the quality of the present population—quality measured in terms of character, education, philosophy. A nation of thieves, a nation of illiterates, a nation of lotus-eaters, would not be further immigrants. An active co-operative population of high educational standards, guided by a philosophy that, with proper safeguards, places the welfare of the community above that of the individual, can be expected to make a greater success of its national business than would a society that lacks these qualities. There is a direct line of cause and effect from high educational standards through an intelligent exploitation of resources to an increased capacity to absorb immigrants.

What, then, is the absorptive capacity of Canada today? The answer is that no one knows. There is no means of measuring it.

There are, however, a few facts that can be used to advantage in the consideration of this problem.

It is quite clear that the modern, industrialized, expanding economy of Canada in these post-war years is far more capable of receiving and employing immigrants than has ever before been the case in the national history, except perhaps for a few short years when the western prairies were first being opened to general settlement. The distinctive characteristic of Canada today is a factory, not a farm.

During the war Canadians proved that they could produce manufactured articles of a variety and a quality that far surpassed anything previously attempted or imagined. Much has been heard of the great speed with which the phenomenal American, Mr. Henry Kaiser, turned out vessels for the wartime demands of the United States. Yet we in Canada had a shipyard that built better ships, at lower cost, and in a shorter time! Many of the best gun-barrels used by the allied forces were made in Canada, and optical glass which we had never previously attempted was made to the finest specifications of the trade. It is time that we got over our sheepish assumption that Americans or Englishmen, can do everything better than we can. It is not true.

Many of our wartime innovations—these discoveries of our own abilities—will enable Canada to compete more effectively in the world of post-war trade. Canada is now primarily an industrial nation. And the history of industrialization shows a record of rapidly increasing population.

IV.

The second point made by Mr. King was summarized as follows:

> *There is no intention of allowing mass immigration to make a fundamental change in the character of the Canadian population. In consequence, Asiatic immigrants must continue to be barred except in certain particular cases. At the same time the Canadian Government will be prepared to enter into special arrangements with any country "for the control of the admission of immigrants on a basis of complete equality and reciprocity."*

At the present time the only persons of Asiatic racial origin who are admissible to Canada are the wives and minor children of Canadian citizens. The reasons for objecting to an unrestricted, or even a large, movement of Oriental immigrants are obvious in the light of the difficulties of assimilation and integration that have already been experienced with even a relatively small movement of such persons. If the barriers against Asiatic immigration were removed there is not the least doubt that there would be a tremendous influx of immigrants from the depressed lands of the middle and far east. This movement would certainly result in "a fundamental change in the character of the Canadian population." At the same time it would do little if anything to solve the population problems of such countries as China and Japan. The children born in China in one week would fill every passenger liner on the Pacific Ocean for a year. The solution for the Oriental population problem—if there is a solution—must be found in other ways.

V.

The third heading of my summary was the following:

During the depression and the war immigration was inevitably restricted; now the categories of admissible persons have been considerably widened. Special steps will be taken to provide for the admission of carefully selected immigrants from among the Displaced Persons of Europe.

In line with this policy the Canadian government since the conclusion of hostilities, has taken the following steps:

A. The Immigration Service, reduced to minor proportions during the years of depression and war, has been strengthened and revitalized until now it is a strong and efficient instrument of government policy. Incidentally, some of the best of our new officials have been recruited from among our compatriots of French racial origin.

B. Regulations have been changed with the result that barriers against British immigrants from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, against French-born immigrants from France, and against immigrants from the United States have been reduced to the bare minimum of good health, the absence of obviously subversive political views, and reasonable evidence of capacity for personal maintenance and adjustment.

C. The list of admissible relatives of legal residents of Canada has been extended to include everyone closer than a cousin—cousin is such an elastic term! It also includes persons (of either sex) engaged to marry the residents who make application for their admission. Previously the man could send for his girl; now the girl has the right to import her prospective husband.

D. Special provision has been made for the entrance of 40,000 persons, who were not otherwise admissible, from the Displaced Persons camps of Europe. D.P. relatives of persons already resident in Canada are, of course, outside the quota. Thus on the present basis Canada's ultimate contribution to the solution of this problem may involve the movement of something like 100,000 D.P.'s.

In connection with the movement of D.P.'s it is well to remind ourselves that the Canadian government took the initiative among overseas countries in acting to ameliorate this concentration of human misery. Not only did this country act first, without waiting for a general international agreement, but for many months Canada was admitting more D.P.'s than all other non-European countries combined. Our total is still considerably higher than that of any country outside Europe, including the United States. This is a fact that should be recalled when the real or alleged programs of other countries are published in the press to the disadvantage of our own contribution.

Exceptional difficulties have been encountered in carrying through some aspects of the post-war Canadian policy. Apart from the movement of D.P.'s, immigration from continental Europe has been almost impossible. East of the red curtain drawn across the continent by the fanatical devotees of the Communist religion the totalitarian governments do not readily permit their people to leave—except under circumstances which make the immigrant a rather dubious asset from the point of view of the receiving country.

In Western Europe also, certain countries, notably France, do not permit emigration except in special cases. Even in Great Britain the government is not anxious to have its people leave, although, holding fast to its tradition of personal liberty, it has made no effort to stop those who decide to go. Many citizens of the United Kingdom, however, feel that it is their patriotic duty to remain in their native land and help in the valiant effort that the British people are making to overcome the gravest economic problems that their embattled islands have ever had to face. Under such circumstances the Canadian government, while providing facilities for the admission of persons from the British Isles, believes that any high-powered immigrant recruiting campaign in the United Kingdom would be in bad taste at this time. This restraint has been recognized and has been the subject of appreciative comment in Great Britain.

In addition to these difficulties another great obstacle to the flow of immigrants from overseas has been the shortage of transport. In pre-war days there was an average of fourteen or fifteen passenger liners on regular service between European and Canadian ports. During a large part of 1947 there was one, and at the end of 1948 there were only two I.R.O. ships, carrying D.P.'s exclusively, and four passenger liners.

The Canadian government paid three hundred thousand dollars to convert a German prize vessel for immigrant service, and the "Beaverbrae" is now sailing regularly between Halifax and Bremerhaven—with priorities on its western voyages being given to the relatives of persons resident in Canada. In addition the government paid the Cunard Line a considerable sum to keep the "Aquitania" in the Atlantic service throughout 1948. Other vessels are slowly coming into this trade, and it is hoped that something approaching normal conditions will prevail by the end of 1949. Finally the government entered into an agreement with the Trans-Canada Air Lines by which ten thousand additional air passages are being made available on chartered planes between the first of May, 1948 and the 31st of March, 1949.

VI.

Turning now from a description of the Canadian policy, may I say just a word about its results? These can be summarized as follows:

Total immigration to Canada which sank to less than 11,500 during the depression (1935), and to less than 7,500 at one stage during the war (1942), has grown since the ending of hostilities in Europe in the following manner:

Calendar year	1946— 25,640	plus 46,000 war brides
" "	1947— 64,127	dependents of returning Canadian servicemen.
" "	1948—123,000	(approximately)

An analysis of the immigration figures for the fiscal year 1947-48 gives some interesting information.

(i) Of all the immigrants who entered Canada, 29% gave Continental Europe as their last place of permanent residence; 53% came from the British Isles; 11% from the United States; and other countries accounted for the remaining 7%.

(ii) The destination of these immigrants in Canada was as follows: 5% went to the Maritimes; 16% to Quebec; 54% to Ontario; 12% to the Prairie Provinces; and 13% to British Columbia, the Yukon, and the Northwest Territories.

(iii) D.P.'s constituted 18% of the total immigrant movement.

(iv) It is sometimes charged that the D.P. policy unduly favours or discriminates against certain racial groups. The facts disprove this charge. Of the many nationalities that were included in the move- of D.P.'s up to March 31, 1948, the larger groups were: Polish, 25%; Ukrainian, 23%; Hebrew, 16%; Lithuanian, 14%; Latvian, 6%; Dutch, 5%; others 11%.

In contrast to the experience of earlier years it is interesting to note that there has been little organized opposition to the current expansion of the movement of immigrants to Canada. Certain sections of the country which have traditionally looked critically on any substantial movement of this character have voiced little opposition during the last two years. The same has also been true of the organized labour movement which has helped rather than endeavoured to hinder the admission of new Canadians, particularly the D.P.'s. This is especially creditable because the D.P.'s do come into competition with certain labour groups, although fortunately there is work enough for all in most parts of Canada today.

Actually the only trades unions that have strongly opposed the admission of competitive D.P.'s have been the medical and dental professions—although this does not, of course, represent the attitude of all Canadian doctors and dentists. There has also been persistent and organized opposition from certain Communist groups.

VII.

So much for the Government's policy and its current results. What are the prospects for the future?

The movement of immigrants to Canada will always, of course, be conditioned by the state of international relations. If the criminal insanity of war is again allowed to take control of human affairs, immigration will be one of the first casualties.

Moreover, the Canadian economy is still very largely dependent upon international trade, and a prolonged continuation of the present chaos in this field will so affect our national welfare that we shall lose much of our ability successfully to absorb those who wish to come from other lands to find new homes in Canada. The maintenance of conditions approximating full employment is a prerequisite to a healthy movement of population. An expanding economy at home is the surest guarantee of an expanding movement of immigrants from abroad. There must be jobs or there will be few immigrants.

Over a longer period there is, in my mind, no doubt as to the future. Canada is at last on the verge of a period of vast development. Canadians are now ready for the responsibilities of a great nation.

Psychologically we have lost the inferiority complex that used to find expression in a colonial subservience towards Britain or a constant sneering criticism of the United States.

Economically we have shown that we can compete on equal terms not only in the production of wheat and lumber but in the most intricate processes of industry and commerce.

Our potential resources are no longer a matter of faith and hope—today, in the light of developments in Quebec, Newfoundland, the Northwest Territories and above all, in Alberta, we *know* that we have a sound basis for a splendid future.

Our political and judicial institutions have been tested and have proved their adaptability and their strength.

Socially, in the fields of education, scientific research, the care for human welfare, the development of the arts, the recognition of the dignity of labour, we have established a record which, with all its imperfections, is something on which we can base a fair hope for the future.

Above all we can rely upon ourselves—upon the people of Canada. This beautiful but hard land has not been won by weaklings. The pioneers of New France, of Acadia, of Upper Canada, of the great West, and now of the stirring North, were and are men and women of quality, of strength and character. The record of our armed forces in two world wars has given final proof of this quality.

We are citizens of no mean country. Without boastfulness or arrogance we can take a modest but warming pride in our past and present achievements and look with confidence to a future of continued progress at home, and hope for co-operation abroad from all countries and peoples of good will.

In 1905 Sir Wilfred Laurier said that as the 19th Century had been the century of the United States, so the 20th Century will be the century of Canada. So far that prophecy has not been fulfilled. But when, 51 years from today, our sons and daughters look back on the century that will then have ended, I believe that they will say that Sir Wilfred spoke more truly than he knew.

"REPORTING TO THE PUBLIC"

AN ADDRESS BY

JOHN S. COLEMAN, LL.B.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, February 10th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

I think we would all agree that this is a machine age and that the vast organizations that have sprung up during the last few decades would not have been possible without amazing developments in machinery.

Most of us think of machinery in terms of mass production in factories, but it is equally true that this is the machine age as far as the white collar workers are concerned. All up-to-date offices are equipped with bookkeeping, calculating and adding machines, which do an amazing job in the simplification of office work and I feel that those of us who are familiar with these machines will agree that the Burroughs Adding Machine Company has made an outstanding contribution to the development of this type of equipment.

Our guest of honour today is Mr. John S. Coleman, President of The Burroughs Adding Machine Company of Detroit, Michigan.

Mr. Coleman was born in Charlestown, West Virginia, where he was educated and graduated from Georgetown University Law School.

He served overseas in France for two years in the First World War and shortly after he was demobilized joined the staff of The Burroughs Adding Machine Company as a junior salesman and has been with the Company ever since.

Promotion was very rapid and he finally was elected President in 1946. Some idea of the magnitude of his job can be gathered from the fact that his Company now employ over 20,000 people and their products are sold in all parts of the world.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Mr. John S. Coleman, the title of whose address will be "Reporting to the Public."

It has been announced that my topic today is, "Reporting to the Public." That's a simple enough subject, perhaps, and one which implies nothing very remarkable. After all, there are statutes, as well as the requirements for being listed on stock exchanges which require a corporation to make specified reports to the public. This has been going on for some time, so why should I travel all the way from Detroit to talk to an audience as well informed as this one is on a topic which is as commonplace as this apparently is?

Of course, that is a rhetorical question. But it is remarkable that a subject which appears to be as simple as telling the public about your business should be such a hot spot in contemporary life. If there is a phase of business activity which gets more attention these days than ways and means of explaining Business, I don't know what it is.

For the purposes of our discussion today, it is not important how this came to be such a problem. We all know something about it; and we and our predecessors, I am sorry to say, have some responsibility for it. What I should like to do in the few minutes I have is to cover the most acute aspects of our problem and to offer one or two courses which may alleviate it.

In Canada and across the border, in the United States —two of the places on this earth which Business: buying, manufacturing and selling, has helped most to build to world leadership — there are a few groups of people who are organized to make business less effective. More important still, there are even greater potential forces, who don't much care how effective Business is. Some statisticians tell us that substantial numbers of our population feel that they would be better off if Business were under some system of greater government control than it is now.

Business, and particularly that ogre, Big Business, are too often blamed for much of what is wrong with our two countries. Some of this blame is applied for political reasons, some through honest misunderstanding. Whatever the reason, though, the public at large has many serious misconceptions about Business and Businessmen.

These misconceptions are serious because they are likely to be the basis for action which can do a lot more harm than good to their perpetrators and to everyone else in the long run.

Gentlemen, there is only one way in which these misapprehensions can be corrected. That is for businessmen to correct them.

The job of correcting misapprehensions of Business is primarily one of creating confidence in Business. And this is not a job which can be done by abstract treatment. One of the reasons that we say Business is misunderstood is that the word "Business" itself is an abstraction. What do people mean when they talk about Big Business and its alleged evils? Try to pin them down, and the chances are they don't *know* what they mean.

Somehow or other, an abstract concept of Business, with a capital "B", has been built up. It is mysterious because no one can see it or identify it. And like many such intangibles, it disturbs people. The mere fact, though, that nothing of the sort exists doesn't mean that it can be laughed off. It's a serious fear of some people, and some others make it their business to see that the Business Bogeyman continues to be a threat.

The way to dispel this ghost is to remove it from the abstract: demonstrate that no conspiracy of corporations or tycoons exist; demonstrate that the collective term "business" simply means around four million separate enterprises in this country and in the United States, all of which are competing with each other for their share of the consumer's dollar.

But even at this point, the concept is something of an abstraction. Very few people have a clear idea of what a million or so enterprises look like. So, in my opinion, we must go much further in our efforts to destroy this bogeyman. Our efforts can be a great deal more effective and the results a great deal more permanent, if rather than talking about our four million businesses, each of the four million of us talks about his own business.

The problem is just that simple. The management of each of the business enterprises in this country and in the United States must tell the story of its own company, not to the whole world, necessarily—that job is too big for one company—but just to the people who have some interest in their company. Each company has its own "public"; its employees, its owners, its customers, its suppliers, and its neighbours. If a management can "sell" most of these people the idea that their company is doing a good job, that management has made a big contribution to restoring confidence in our business system.

If *each* of these four million managements can sell *its* public in the same way, the problem is pretty well solved. Remember that these various "publics" overlap to a large extent; so such a sales program would cover very nearly the whole population of our two countries.

Now, the question arises: what is the best way to create confidence in your company among the individual members of your public? Well, I'm reminded of the classic public relations story. A restaurant owner who had been losing money retained a public relations counsel to help him out. At their first meeting, the proprietor said, "My problem is to get people to think that I serve top quality food here. Can you tell me how to go about creating that impression?"

"Sure," said the public relations counsel, "You start by *serving* top quality food."

And so it is in creating confidence in any business enterprise. The first thing to do is to be sure that one's operating policies and practices are such that they will inspire confidence.

Specifically, that means, first, to be sure that one is giving one's customers or clients the best possible value for their dollar. It means providing goods and services to people who want them at the time they want them, and at a price they are willing to pay. That's elementary, of course.

With respect to stockholders, this endeavor to create confidence means that a management must start by assuring itself that the earning power of the stockholder's dollar is as great as possible; that he gets a fair return on his investment not only today, but next year.

As for the employee, it means that working conditions are as good as can be devised and that a fair wage is paid for a fair day's work, both now and in the future.

With regard to the neighbours, it means that the Company must be a good citizen, in the best sense of the word.

Having assured itself that its organization is living up to its responsibilities to all these members of its public, management's next job is to be sure that they understand what the Company is doing. This is where the reporting job arises.

Now, by this time, it is probably evident what I believe the reporting job to be. It is more than merely sending a year-end balance sheet and operating statement to the stockholders—although, of course, that is generally a requirement, too. For the purpose of this discussion, I should like to suggest that we understand "reports" to mean *all* the communications from a company to its public.

At this point, I might say that it is usually a good idea, before undertaking a broad program of communication with the public, to have a pretty clear idea of policy to be followed. Naturally, efforts to increase confidence among such varied groups as stockholders, customers, employees, and the general public should complement each other. With a good concept of policy in its mind, management can interpret its company consistently to all groups without conflicting actions or statements. And, conversely, of course, one of the surest ways to destroy confidence in a company is for its management to permit inconsistencies in its statements to, or actions with, the various segments of its public.

Now let us look at some of the things which corporate managements have done to foster confidence among the various publics. A particularly strong human urge is a desire to know what's going on. Even when we can't do much to control what is going on around us, we can adapt ourselves to situations with more confidence when we understand them than we can when we are in the dark. The pleasure of being "on the inside" is a similar feeling.

Since these feelings exist, some managements have recognized them and taken action to gratify them. The results have been an increase in confidence and trust on the part of both employees and stockholders.

Frank answers to inquiries, both through written replies to letters and oral replies to spoken questions are important in fostering feelings of confidence. This implies both an informed supervisory force, and a top management which is willing to take the time and trouble to answer questions. The primary potential weakness of any system which does not actively solicit questions, though, is the danger inherent in not always knowing what questions people would like answers to.

There are ways to minimize this danger, though. Opinion surveys, suggestion systems, and, above all, again, a well-trained and informed supervisory force, which is able to recognize questions and keep both employees and top management informed—these are some of the tools which have been used to provide employees with information.

Regional stockholders meetings and written inquiries have achieved similar results for stockholders.

There are certain other somewhat mechanical techniques which have been used successfully to keep employees informed. They are concerned mainly with notifying employees of major personnel changes and new developments in practices, procedures and policies before they read them in the newspapers. Bulletin board notices and letters mailed to employees' homes are particularly useful.

Some managements have prepared booklets describing their companies, which they make available to employees, stockholders and the public. A knowledge of the history, present operations, and future plans of a company is a valuable ingredient of any program for building confidence and understanding.

There are other devices, too: some very elaborate; some quite simple. Some managements have produced motion pictures for employee, stockholder, and public viewings. These films have covered a variety of subjects, all the way from company histories to explanations of practical economics in terms of a company's operations. My own company has undertaken an effort of this kind, with sufficient success to encourage us to consider repeating it.

And there are numerous methods of showing the general public that the company is a desirable citizen of the community. A policy of keeping the press informed is a good one. Some companies make it a practice to send news releases to all local newspapers whenever there are important or news-worthy happenings in a company. Frank answers to questions from reporters are, naturally, very important.

Plant open-houses for members of the community have been used to good effect. Factory tours for local citizens, including school children, are another helpful aid to increased understanding.

Perhaps most important of all, though, as media for interpreting a company, are its financial statements. The annual report which sets forth an account of the year's operations is a natural tool for this purpose. Many companies feel that the day has passed when a four-page folder covered with dollar signs and technical accounting language can be expected to tell the public all it needs to—or should—know about a company.

The limitations of the language of accounts and, indeed, of mere balance sheets and operating statements are a topic which again and again arises to plague managements and baffle the uninitiated.

One of the results of total dependence on little more than such statements to keep the public informed on financial operations is the misunderstanding and even mistrust which we recognize today. Why is it that the average teen-age boy can tell you more about nuclear fission, television, and jet-propulsion, than he can about the way a business enterprise operates? One of the reasons is that in the past, Business has not been too aggressive in telling its story to the public. Another is the limitations of traditional accounting techniques and language as vehicles for the communication of that story.

Consequently, one of the areas in which the public has least confidence in Business today is its financial operations. If the layman has done any thinking about the financial working of Business, he probably envisions them about this way:

"You buy materials, make them into finished products, mark up the price so as to get whatever the consumer will pay, and then sell it to him. Let's say that you started at the beginning of the year with a million dollars and you finish the year with a million, one hundred thousand. You then have a hundred thousand dollars profit."

Now, Gentlemen, if our layman is a stockholder, he may figure something like this:

"The company made a profit of $100,000; there are 100,000 shares of stock—that's a dollar a share. Aha! When do I get my cheque?"

Then when he gets his check he sees that he has been paid only fifty cents a share in dividends. His immediate reaction is likely to be, "The management is holding out on me." Then if he isn't already disillusioned about financial statements, he looks at this company's latest report to see if he can find what the management has done with the rest of his money.

Or, let's assume that our hypothetical layman is an employee of the company. He reads headlines in the newspaper that his company's sales hit a new high of two million dollars last year. "Two million—that's a lot of money!" Then he reads a little farther and he sees that profits reached a new high of a hundred thousand dollars. "Hmm! That's still a lot of money to have left over at the end of the year. Why don't I get some of it? The management's holding out on me!"

Then, let's assume that he takes the trouble to try to find in the company's latest financial statement an indication of where the money went. Let's see, if we can, what the stockholder and the employee find.

The first thing they find is two or three pages covered with figures (some of them running into the millions), all with dollar signs in front of them.

"That's pretty impressive—somebody got a lot of money last year."

Then they see that the figures are divided into two categories: One is headed "Balance Sheet" and the other is headed "Statement of Income and Surplus."

"That title, 'balance sheet' doesn't mean very much; but here we are: 'statement of income and surplus.' We're interested in the income—that's the cash the company took in. And here's the surplus—that's what was left over which the company didn't need. Why didn't the management spread a little of that surplus around? That's purchasing power which we didn't get."

Well, if our friends aren't too worked up to drop the whole matter in disgust at this point, they look around a bit further, and they find an item headed "depreciation." What it means isn't very clear, but it is something that the management took out of the income it took in.

"I wonder if that could be a hiding place for some of the money that I didn't get."

"Now here are some things headed 'reserves.' They total up to a good fat amount, too. Wonder what they are being held back for?"

And so it goes. Our investor and our employee deduce from the figures that the report shows that the Company handled a lot of money during the year, and made a bigger profit than ever before. The words in the report don't tell very much except to imply that something has been held out—something which the employee and the investor think they should have shared in.

The next conclusion is that the business is rotten and the people who run it are dishonest.

So, there's our problem. How is it to be solved?

There are two possibilities. One of them is to revise the basic accounting principles by which financial facts are developed and presented to the public; the other is to try to explain what the facts mean as they are presented today.

The solution will, ultimately, require both courses of action. However, basic changes in our accounting system, if undertaken too quickly, would result in even more confusion, more misunderstanding, and less confidence in Business than we have today. So this course should be followed more closely.

Since we are badly in need of better understanding at once, though, it is absolutely necessary to explain our accounting system and the vocabulary it employs in terms which are clear to the layman. The area of what the public accountant calls "generally accepted accounting principles" is as unfamiliar and confusing to the untrained mind as the Western Ocean must have been to the sea-captains before Columbus. So, if I may continue this analogy, it seems to me that large-scale charts of the most-commonly-traveled routes must be provided for the novice.

Just one or two simple examples can explain the sort of thing I mean. If the untrained critics of our system of business could be made to grasp the concept that a "reserve for depreciation," followed by a dollar sign and some figures in dollars and odd cents do not represent a neat pile of currency and coins being held "in reserve" in the president's safe, we would be making progress. And if the public could understand that a corporation which shows a million dollars in profit at the end of the year may still have no cash in the bank, then we'd really be getting somewhere.

Now, of course, no single annual financial statement can accomplish all that has to be done. But if each business concern which does issue such a statement can make its operations a little clearer to its public, the aggregate effect will soon begin to be felt in terms of less suspicion and more confidence.

There you have it. I have tried to suggest a few of the reporting techniques which Management can use to lessen the misunderstanding of Business which I believe to be one of the major obstacles in the path of peace and prosperity not only in our countries, but in the world. The people of our two countries: employees, investors, farmers, legislators, yes, and businessmen, must understand that the strength of our nations depends on our business enterprises being healthy and productive. And as long as our nations remain strong, there is hope for a world in which famine, disease, and unrest can be minimized.

It's a challenge, but I am confident the obstacle is surmountable. And I believe that the individual businessman, working in his own bailiwick to show that his business is in the public interest, is the man who will overcome it.

"THE ONLY WAY TO SAVE CIVILIZATION"

An Address By

MAJOR GLADSTONE MURRAY,
M.C., D.F.C., CROIX de G.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, February 17th, 1949

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

Here in Canada and the United States we have a standard of living unequalled anywhere else in the world and undoubtedly as far as the average citizen is concerned, the highest standard of civilization yet achieved in the history of man. And yet, there are people enjoying those privileges who seek ardently and persistently to destroy them. They openly advocate the doctrines of a Government which has made slaves of its people and destroyed their liberties.

Today, our guest of honour is Major Gladstone Murray, who I would describe as an ardent crusader for our way of life.

Major Murray addressed The Empire Club in October, 1943, when the title of his address was "Canada and the Empire of Tomorrow."

That tomorrow is here but it is not what we had hoped for. While we are at peace, yet there is no peace and the world at large is in a very troubled state. And so today Major Murray has chosen as the title for his address "The Only Way to Save Civilization."

Major Gladstone Murray, ever a champion of private enterprise, has had a very colourful career. A brilliant student he finally went to New College Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar.

In World War I he was one of the pioneer members of The Royal Flying Corps and flew 3,500 hours in action, truly a remarkable record, during which he was shot down several times.

After the war, Major Murray wrote for Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* and helped to establish the B.B.C. in 1923. Through its pioneer stages he rose to the top of a broadcasting system which has become a model for governmental broadcasting the world over.

In 1936 he accepted an appointment as General Manager of the C.B.C. and was later appointed Director-General of Broadcasting for Canada.

Six years ago, Major Murray responded to the call of industry and business to organize and operate The Responsible Enterprise Movement, a point of reference for all agencies engaged in repelling the advance of Collectivism.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Major Gladstone Murray, M.C., D.F.C., Croix de Guerre, whose subject, as I have already mentioned, is "The Only Way to Save Civilization."

HONOURED GUESTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

To gain understanding of the problems of today it is necessary to envisage these problems as a consequence of history.

Many of our troubles flow from the tendency to run away from history, or to regard history as merely the chronicle of one thing after another, a clutter of petty futilities.

The role of spectator is no longer possible,—we are all now perforce agents of history, which, rightly envisaged, is the process of the emergence of new forms and values of living.

Man achieves civilization not chiefly as a result of superior biological endowment or geographical environment but as a response to a challenge in a situation which rouses him to make a hitherto unprecedented effort.

How is modern man distinguished from the cave-man? Not chiefly in technology, despite the prevalent view. More important is the emergence of the ideal and the fact of freedom; below man there is nothing but the inexorable operation of natural cause and natural effect. The chief function of history is to teach men to be free. Another function, closely related, is to produce that which is individual and unique; the emergence of individuality. There are people alive today still in the pre-historic stage, close tribal groups, bound by unquestioned customs, each member unable to think or act for himself because it never occurred to him to do so. In these remnants of prehistoric society there is little more individuality than in a flock of sheep.

In the West during the past three thousand years, men have risen from mere massness into individuality, from sameness to difference. The process of individualisation has gone along with that of freedom. The mass comes first, the individual last. Distinctive persons did not produce the group; they were differentiated out of it.

The chief individualising force was the Christian idea of divine dispensation, because its Gospel taught that God was concerned not with humanity but with men. The Renaissance, The Reformation, and the Counter-Reformation all played their part in the progress of freedom.

Some civilizations have arisen not from the challenge of geographical factors but from the challenge of their human environment, from the challenge of dominant minorities,—a ruling class that ceased to lead and became merely oppressive.

The advancing river of freedom and individualisation reached its flood level in the 19th Century and kept on until about 1918. The ferment throughout the long process was wholesome. Then about 1930 the mounting curve turned downwards, between 1930 and 1940 there was a deliberate reversal of the trend of centuries. The delicate structures of civilized freedom were wantonly torn down in a calculated assault on human values.

The Second World War was won in military terms and lost in moral terms. The moral collapse has spread.

Where freedom remains it is less by conviction than by habit.

Arnold Toynbee and T. E. Jessop are among the contemporary thinkers who have logically diagnosed our predicament. While extinction is not a remote possibility it is not yet inevitable. There is still time for an awakening that could be decisive if it takes the form of a response adequate to the dread challenge of these times.

Internal weakness is invariably the prime cause of break-down. The abandonment of the Roman roads, and of the Mesopotamian irrigation system, were the result, not the cause of the break-down of the civilizations that had evolved and sustained them. Decline of active faith in freedom is a basic trouble today.

All history warns against short-cuts to progress. Where the uncreative majority follows the leadership of a creative minority by mimesis, a species of drill, a mechanical and superficial imitation of the inspired original, the invariable danger is that the leaders become infected by the mechanicalness of their followers. The result is an arrested civilization, in which the leaders substitute the whip of compulsion for persuasion. Then the creative minority is transformed into a dominant minority and its disciples into a reluctant and alienated proletariat. When this happens disintegration is inevitable. The society loses is capacity for self-determination, and the ensuing revolution is a delayed and consequently explosive act of mimesis.

Russia is a case in point. More Eastern than Western, Russia had not long been rid of serfdom. The creative minority under the Tsars had become a dominant minority alienated from the people,—still a vast area of illiteracy. There is no real change. The continued political backwardness of Russia today is revealed by her reliance on vulgar propaganda, secret police, foreign espionage, bluster and force. Communism in Russia is not the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat; it is dictatorship over the proletariat by the Communist Party comprising less than four per cent of the people, and dictatorship over the Party by a handful of leaders. The result is that all interest and all values are concentrated in the group and none in the individual.

Communism ushered in the era of internal political violence as the method of change. The method was consciously borrowed and applied by both the Fascists and the Nazis. When these were subdued Communism took over their spheres of influence without the need of changing methods.

It is a fact of history that the group which successfully responds to one challenge is rarely successful in meeting the next challenge. The Jews, responding to the challenge of the Old Testament, are worsted by the challenge of the New Testament. The Athens of Pericles declines into the Athens of St. Paul. A "ghost" of the Roman Empire caused the break-down of Orthodox Christian society, in a passive surrender to the nemesis of creativity. The lesson for us is clear; our response must be decisive to establish the exception.

Sheer militarism is always suicidal. The Assyrians were ruined because of their sheer military efficiency and aggressiveness. The same fate befell the military machine of the Hohenzollerns.

The sense of drift,—the feeling that the world is ruled by chance or by necessity,—is an invariable symptom of decline. It acts as an opiate.

There is only one unfailing answer, only one secret to the overcoming of break-down and the resumption of progress, and that is transfiguration, the spiritual process that produces the higher religions in their primal vitality.

The chief concern now is not the spread of the totalitarian creed from Soviet Russia but the fact that in other countries freedom is not as highly valued as it was. Modern tendencies have bitten into freedom and individualism. Large-scale industrialisation, by bringing a big proportion of the population into towns, has induced a reversion to the herd-mind, more suggestible and more open to mass fashions than the more independent mind of the countryman. Industrial workers, conscious of their collective power, have become a new vested interest, wielding the weapon of the strike, and swinging elections by their numbers and discipline. Up to a point this movement of industrial workers was justified; but the demand has become excessive, exacting an increasing proportion of wealth when less real wealth is being produced.

That workers should have fair wages and good conditions of employment is now recognized except behind the Iron Curtain. But the belief that workers can continue to get higher rewards with the same or less production threatens breakdown.

From industry there has intruded into politics the idea of efficiency through rationalisation. With machines this is right. But human friction is different from mechanical friction. Men were not made to behave as cogs. The planned economy,—the supreme rationalising,—by its nature, menaces all freedom. It is dehumanising.

The contemporary domination of politics by economics is sapping the very foundations of freedom. For freedom is a moral and not an economic concept. In making the production and distribution of goods and services the main concern we are obscuring the justifying purpose of existence.

There is a general decline of old standards, traditions, and scruples—a landslide from traditional morals and religion. And as the equivalent internal restraints of prudence, conscience, and religion weaken, external restraints have to be multiplied. As morality declines, freedom inevitably declines with it.

The truth is that the shape, texture, and temper of our civilization have been vulgarized by materialism of which Marxism has no monopoly. Culture itself has been vulgarized by industrialisation; our civilization is squeezing freedom out at the time we need it most.

And the chief culprit is that impalpable and universal creature the "common man" who no one will admit to being and whom no one has ever seen. The cult of the "common man" has induced the ordinary citizen to seek again organization in masses, to use his collective power to force the State to become more meddlesome and mighty than ever before. Consider what is happening in Britain. Direction by employers is being exchanged for direction by Trade Union leaders, political party bosses, and State bureaucrats. The ordinary citizen is not a partner in the State, which he should be, but a ward of the State. He is not really consulted; he is crooned to and nursed; not challenged but manipulated. After the sacrifice of centuries, freedom is being yielded for a willing bondage under the elusive inducement of immediate material advantages. The effort that brought the citizen differentiation seems to be exhausting itself, and he is reverting to the mass whence he started. From collectivism to collectivism is the real tragedy of these times.

Fortunately the process has not gone so far as to be hopeless. Flaming ideals still can be imparted because man is mostly a metaphysical being. His life contracts or widens as his belief becomes narrow or wide. The gifts of imagination and reason enable us to organize our ideas into a world that becomes the reality in which we live. Ideas, therefore, are the principal realities. Beyond reason there is conscience. The defining quality of ideals is their validity.

The central fact is that man is fundamentally a moral being. That the light we have is imperfect does not matter as long as we are always trying to improve it. There is no real freedom without the implication of a spiritual world. Man is unique in dignity, a cosmic dignity, a high status in the universe.

We are equal in sharing the moral freedom that distinguishes us as free men. Man's status makes each individual an end in himself. No man is by nature simply the servant of the State, or of another man.

The real course of evolution is movement from the undifferentiated to the differentiated, from the generic to the specific, from the collective to the individual, from common and anonymous to personal and signed achievement—all made possible by man's emancipation from the natural compulsions that rule everything else but man.

As has been observed already, the ideal and fact of freedom,—and not technology—are the true distinguishing marks of our civilization. But in recent times the thing which the West has been exporting to the great non-western majority of mankind is not freedom but technology. The law and the free institutions on which the West rightly prides itself grew up in a moral climate created by Christianity, but the technology that is a by-product of Western law and liberty has been cut adrift from the religious and cultural soil that nourished its origin.

Our technology, being propagated apart from its original spiritual setting, has become destructive; rivalling Communism in its destructiveness. What the modern West exports is not a new vision of God; it is the power that is generated by the application of organization to science. As Arnold Toynbee puts it "We are now selling our souls to Leviathan, and if we complete the transaction the funeral will not be Christianity's but ours. Christianity can take care of itself. A Christian tradition existed before our western civilization was heard of, and the spiritual force will continue whatever happens to us".

The concepts of freedom and the structures laboriously built thereon are now in mortal danger. There is indeed no room now for spectators; we are all perforce agents of history.

The challenge of reversion to the mass calls for a supreme response. Faith in freedom is not a vague abstraction to be displayed on patriotic occasions and then carefully put away in mothballs. Internal weakness, the principal cause of break-down, is due to drift, inertia, indifference, and corroding cynicism—all of which are gaining ground.

It is unlikely that the trend backwards to the Collectivism of primitive slave societies will be reversed unless and until there is widespread spiritual regeneration. The things that men believe are the dynamic realities of living; material environment is only a shadow of reality.

Fortunately there is a gleam of light. Christianity, as opposed to institutionalism, is gaining ground. Individual religious experience as opposed to external authority is becoming "The impregnable rock" of faith. The revolt from regimentation finds no more eloquent expression than in the chambers where individual men and women engage in prayer. In the face of the God-less darkness spreading across the world, I believe the crust of sectarian ice is cracking and thawing.

To sum up,—the organisation of the free world must proceed, the material support of war ravaged countries must continue; re-armament must go forward—all these things contribute to the protection of our civilisation but by themselves they will not succeed. The real strength of Communism is its Asiatic fanaticism, utterly ruthless, destructive and pagan, based on hate, envy and frustration, a devotion which recognises no limits. Its "Achilles Heel" is the denial of the power of love as taught by Christianity. The attempt of the Communists to exterminate the Christian religion by persecuting and imprisoning its exponents is having just the opposite result. Eternal truth emerges from martyrdom and persecution strengthened and refreshed.

The priority of spiritual values contains the decisive answer to all materialist fallacies. In establishing this fundamental truth in the public mind the Churches have a special responsibility. This, however, cannot be discharged by amateur excursions into economics or by blundering descents into partisan politics. No longer can we afford to regard religion as the object of amiable lip-service once a week. The practice of the Christian virtues is the first ingredient of the new citizenship which, by restoring morality, will make possible the resumption of progress.

In organisations such as service clubs, professional and business associations, trade unions, universities, colleges, and schools—wherever free men and women co-operate for some good purpose—spiritual awakening should be proclaimed. And more important still; most important of all; is the re-dedication and the sanctifying of the home so that there will be myriad centres radiating brotherhood, tolerance, humility, and understanding.

An effective response to the challenge of today cannot be less than the greatest crusade of all time to release every human being on this globe from the grim bondage of materialism.

Without such a transfiguration, without a generous stirring of the souls of men, economic or military conquest will only delay the ultimate catastrophe, will be only the prelude to further struggles, until the shattered remnants of human society fade out for centuries, perhaps for ever.

"WAS THE KING RIGHT"

AN ADDRESS BY

M. L'ABBÉ ARTHUR MAHEUX, F.R.S.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, February 24th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

In introducing our guest of honour today, I feel that some reference to the subject of Canadian Unity is appropriate.

In the two great Provinces of the Dominion, Ontario and Quebec, we have two peoples, two races, two languages and on their ability to co-operate and work in harmony with a common understanding, so much depends.

Unfortunately, it is a subject that has been used as a political football which tends to foster disunity and make the problem more complex,

Today we welcome as our guest speaker, Monsieur L'Abbé Arthur Maheux, who has devoted much time for many years to the cause of better understanding between the French and English cultures in Canada.

Last year he was called to the University of Toronto to succeed Prime Minister St. Laurent as speaker on the Gray Foundation and to initiate a long-term program of exchange of professors between Laval and Toronto Universities. His visit was an outstanding success in creating a greater desire among staff and students for closer contacts and better understanding between Toronto and Quebec. He is considered by many to be one of the great architects of Canadian Unity in our time.

Monsieur L'Abbé is head of the Department of History and Geography, Laval University, President Canadian Historical Association; President-General Canadian Catholic Historical Association; Archivist Grand Seminaire de Québec, in which capacity he is in charge of some of the most precious historical documents in Canada.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Monsieur L'Abbé Arthur Maheux, F.R.S.C., who has chosen as the subject of his address "Was The King Right?"

What King? of France? of England? or of another country? King of England, of course. A George or an Edward? It was a George, George the Third.

I shall not be cruel to the point of asking you the dates of his reign, but you certainly have an idea that he reigned nearly two centuries ago.

There you might stop me and ask: What's the idea, of taking us the members of The Empire Club so far back in the past?

I confess my guilt. I have quite deliberately chosen that period of British and Canadian History. Quite natural, for a man who writes and teaches History. Yet, that is not the reason.

My only reason is this: having studied for long years the mutual attitudes of French and English in Canada, I have come to the conclusion that one of the main differences between the two groups is the way they look at History.

In both groups History is a part of the curriculum in elementary, secondary and University course. However, History is never an optional subject for the French Canadian, or any part of it; it is compulsory from the first to the last year. That subject is never second rate, but always first rate, in the eyes of the French Canadian teacher or student.

Associations for the study of local and general history have sprung up in every corner of the province of Quebec; they are active and they have amassed much material, which has been or is being printed and circulated at great expense.

Most of the books printed in French Canada, either in the past or in the present time, are concerned with

History. The market for such books is always good. Garneau's History of Canada has appeared in some ten editions, more or less revised, during a hundred years. In recent times a History of the Province of Quebec since the Confederation, printed in twenty volumes won a considerable success.

The first literary genre cultivated by French Canadian writers was History.

I would not say that the English-speaking Canadians are not interested in History, but I am prepared to say that it is not in the same degree, or to the same extent, or with the same consciousness.

The French Canadians consider History as a solid basis for their national activities. They need to feel that they are different from the other Canadians, and they try to dig up from historical sources all possible evidence to that effect.

The motto of the province of Quebec is 'Je me souviens'. I remember. The French Canadians want to forget nothing of their past, and to use every little bit of History as a food for their national consciousness.

I hardly need to enlarge upon that, since many of your writers and journalists have often blamed the French Canadians for burying themselves in the past, instead of looking at the present or at the future.

What is the present import of that difference of opinion? The import is that the Canadian citizens of today can hardly understand each other, if they do not attach the same value to the same facts.

The French Canadians agree that they have to move along certain lines if they must meet their fellow citizens. For instance, they saw that you were moving fast in applied sciences; consequently they opened Departments of pure and applied sciences in their universities. They expect that you will move towards the study of Canadian history.

We have noticed that your historians gave prominence to the economic and to the social side of History; wishing to meet you on the same ground we have decided to do the same in our textbooks. In return we expect that your writers will give more consideration to the religious side of Canadian history, for this is a major source of misunderstanding between the two groups.

Some facts of the religious life in Canada are treated in just one or two lines by the English Canadian writers, whilst a French Canadian historian will devote to each of them two or three pages.

Moreover, there is a marked tendency, with some French Canadian writers to blame the British authorities for the wrongs they say were inflicted upon their religion. To the question: Was the King right? they always answer The King was wrong, whilst most of the time you would say he was right.

You may disregard that situation. You may blame it on Jean-Baptiste; but I think the disregard or the blame will arrange nothing.

Baptiste always remembers something that happened, and that is to be blamed on the English.

Of course, Baptiste is taught to think that he was always right and never wrong.

This we will call the fact number one. Fact number two is that most French Canadian historians show a marked tendency to blame the English at large for the difficulties they have had during three centuries.

Again you may disregard it or pile another blame on Baptiste. But I think the blame or the disregard will arrange nothing. Most of the difficulties between the two Canadian groups arise from those two facts. Baptiste always remembers something that happened and that is to be blamed on the English. Of course, Baptiste is taught to think that he was always right and never wrong.

Any man endowed with common sense will think that it is impossible for any given nation or group to have always been right and that all the troubles of a given people come from one single cause, namely another people or nation.

Somebody has written that in all discussions or problems there are three sides: your side, my side, and the right side. That may be the case for many points of our Canadian history.

Your historians make little of Dollard des Ormeaux, but ours make him a great hero. Your historians present Bishop Laval as a man possessed with bad temper, but ours make him a hero and a saint. Your historians and ours differ much in the way they explain the Dispersion of the Acadians, the Frontenac raid on Schenectady and Corlar, the burning of farms by the English Army, the Riel Rebellion, the Schools question, to mention only a few of the differences.

As long as we do not come to agree about such problems it is better not to mention National unity.

I have chosen one of the differences, one not already mentioned in the above list. It is the relation between England, particularly the King of Great Britain, and the Roman Catholics of Canada at the beginning of the British rule in Canada.

If you met a French Canadian and a discussion would start about that difficulty, you might say: "My friend, that is an old story, please forget it". Yet, Baptiste will not forget it. He has been taught that Great Britain opposed Catholicism, tried to impose Protestantism, and even did her best to prevent the appointment of a Catholic bishop at Quebec. If all that were true you would only have to say: 'My friend, I confess; my ancestors were wrong and I regret it; I am willing to act quite differently.'

If it were not true you certainly should know the facts and explain to Baptiste that in the instance he is wrong. It may be a surprise to him, but he will be pleased to know that you are interested in the problem, that you have studied it, that you can offer a fair solution. If you speak to him in friendly words you will have done something practical towards the goal of National Unity, and that is worth while.

To that someone might say: 'Do it yourself; it belongs to a French Canadian to enlighten a French Canadian.' I admit. I have done much in that line and I am still working at it. But it takes time to change opinions.

My first attempt was with public lectures at Laval University in 1942. The second was the book I published in French under the title 'Nos Debuts sous le régime anglais', and in English 'French Canada and Britain, a new interpretation'. In the lectures and in the two books I have dealt with the religious problem in Canada at the time of the Cession of New France to Great Britain. Later I discovered new material and I have used it in a paper read before the members of the Canadian Catholic Historical Society. That paper has been printed in the annual Report of that Society.

What is the gist of my research work, that is what I want to say in answer to my question *Was the King Right?*

. . . .

The main difficulty for the French Roman Catholics of Canada in 1764 was the appointment of a bishop. They no longer had a bishop, since Bishop de Pontbriand had died in June, 1760, a few months before the Capitulation of Montreal, and no other had been appointed in his place.

Such an appointment was impossible, as long as the war continued in Europe, and it continued till December, 1762. The Treaty of Paris was signed two months later, in February, 1763. Until that time neither King, of France or of Britain, could move a finger about that matter, as nobody knew what would be the issue of the war or of the treaty.

The same remark applies to the following period of eighteen months, since the Treaty allowed such a length of time to the Canadians to decide whether or not they would stay in Canada. Hence, only in August, 1764, could the question be opened.

What was the general attitude on that question at that time? The British people, in the United Kingdom and in the thirteen colonies, had different views between themselves. The dissenters held that a bishop was not at all necessary; the Anglicans believed the contrary, but they met with a first difficulty in that they had never appointed an Anglican bishop in any of their American Colonies. Canada being a new colony added to the Crown, the same situation might apply to it as to the other colonies, so much so that most of the English-speaking persons, military or civilian, from the United Kingdom or from the thirteen colonies, were Dissenters and not Anglican. As for the Roman Catholics, there were some in the Colonies, but they had no bishop there; their only bishop was in London, according to a rule set by the Pope himself.

There was a precedent to apply, if it were known; it was the case of an island in the Mediterranean Sea, Minorca, which had become a British possession, long years before, and where there was a Catholic bishop by express agreement between Spain and Great Britain; but it seemed to be unknown and nobody ever mentioned it.

I have said that the question could be opened only in August, 1764. That is "officially". Yet it was opened before, for the good reason that to Catholics the presence of a bishop is essential to religious life. Immediately after the Treaty of Paris the diplomatic relations between England and France were re-established and there was a French Embassy at London.

France remained interested in Canada, and especially about religion. During the French regime all the Bishops of Quebec had been chosen by the King of France, by virtue of an old Concordat between the Vatican and France. At the Capitulation of Montreal and the Treaty of Paris the Frenchmen had tried to insert a clause to protect that right of the French King, probably for the sole reason that in their opinion it would be very strange if the Protestant King of Great Britain were to choose a Roman Catholic Bishop and ask the Pope to give him ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The Catholics of Canada had always had in France an official representative under the name of Vicar general. As soon as the Treaty was signed, that representative busied himself with the appointment of a new bishop at Quebec, and the problem came to the fore in the official circles of London. We know, now, that King George the Third himself declared, about a month after the signature of the Treaty, that he would not object to the appointment of a Catholic bishop at Quebec.

The opposition might come from the Anglican archbishop, head of the official church in the United Kingdom. At first glance, one may say that that was to him a queer situation. He, quite naturally, had always opposed the official recognition of a catholic bishop in the British Isles. Was he to approve one in a new colony won by war and treaty? yet, the Anglican Archbishop declared in May, 1764, a little more than a year after the Treaty, that a Roman Catholic bishop would in all probability be given to the Canadians, and that would probably allow the appointment of a first Anglican bishop for the thirteen colonies.

Consequently, the opinion of high political and ecclesiastical circles in London was favourable to the appointment of a catholic bishop at Quebec, even before the end of the military regime in the new Colony.

From London let us go to Quebec. What was the situation there? In the absence of a bishop the administration of the whole diocese was in the hands of three Vicar generals and of the canons. None of these could ordain new priests. It was an abnormal condition, yet it was not new, since it had occurred many times during the French regime, as I have explained in one of my books. But, abnormal it was and it should be redressed as soon as possible. Hence the canons had a meeting and there they elected Mr. de Mongolfier, a prominent Sulpician of Montreal. He proceeded to London in order to have his appointment confirmed by the Crown, and then to obtain jurisdiction from Rome. Mr. de Mongolfier was to meet with two big obstacles.

The first was General James Murray's opposition. Murray's policy was to detach the Canadians from France. In his opinion Mongolfier was a Frenchman by birth, by education and by solid and near family ties. Murray understood well the necessity of a bishop for the Canadians, but he wanted a man with a Canadian, not with a French mind. So he objected to Mongolfier by letters sent to London.

The other obstacle seems almost unconceivable, for it came from the Vatican. The ecclesiastical authorities at Rome severely blamed the Quebec Canons for having dared to proceed to an election, when they had no right to do so. Rome informed Mongolfier that the so-called election was void and null. Mongolfier had no choice, but to return to Canada, which he did.

That was a critical moment. Rome had issued, a few years before, a decree by which all the Roman Catholics in the English colonies were given to the care of the Catholic bishop who resided in London. Consequently, as soon as the Treaty of Paris had been signed, Canada being a new English colony, the Catholics of that Colony were falling under the jurisdiction of that London bishop. Rome might well, to avoid difficulties, have stood by that decree, and it would have been the end of the French-speaking line of bishops in Canada.

Moreover, there was at Rome one Cardinal highly interested in the Catholic affairs of the British Empire. It was Cardinal York, no less than the brother of the Pretender to the British Crown. Cardinal York could easily advise the Pope either not to appoint a new bishop but to let the authority in the hands of the London bishop, or to appoint simply a Vicar apostolic, who might have been an Irish, a Scot or an Englishman; such a solution might well be more acceptable to the British Court and even acceptable to the French Canadians, since the catholic priests in the British Isles received their training in France or Spain and knew the French language. In either hypothesis it meant the end of the French or French Canadian line of bishops at Quebec.

That did not happen. The Quebec canons met again, and that time, instead of electing, they simply named the man who in their opinion was the best to hold the office of bishop in Canada. That man was Olivier Briand, vicar general in Quebec City. James Murray had a high opinion of that priest; though born in France, he was from Britanny, belonged to some humble family, had lived long in Canada and was a Canadian at heart. Murray endorsed the Canons' decision and wrote to the British Court strongly recommending Briand.

Everything should henceforth have worked smoothly. Unfortunately, when Briand arrived at London in 1765 he encountered two difficulties. The first was the political deadlock between the King on one side and the ministers on the other side; nobody wanted to receive visitors or to transact business. The second difficulty was the presence, at London, of an ex-Jesuit, Roubaud, who had come from Quebec, had turned Protestant in England, and was assailing the officials with memoirs, reports and letters about the new colony. He told them that the French Canadians would gladly become Protestants, that even the priests would do so and would marry, and consequently that no bishop was necessary at Quebec.

One can easily imagine the embarrassment of the British officials at London. But Cramahé and Mills, who had been dispatched to London by James Murray, did their best to offset Roubard's insane sayings, and to inform the officials of the real needs of the Canadian Catholics. They found open minds and finally told Briand to go to France and to arrange with Rome for his consecration as a bishop.

That was done and Briand returned to Quebec as a bishop, though he was told that that title was disliked by Protestants and that they would call him the Superintendant of the Roman Church in Canada.

Those are the real facts. But do not expect to find them all in the handbooks of Canadian history.

Take, for instance, a French textbook; a full page, and even two or three are given to that difficulty; the students are let to understand that the British authorities opposed the appointment of a bishop; that they waited long months before allowing it, and that they are blamed for the danger that threatened the religious life of the Canadians. No mention is made of the King's attitude in March, 1763, of the Anglican Archbishop in May, 1764, of the Vatican's attitude, of Roubaud's activities.

Take now an English textbook; one line is enough to say: A bishop was given to the Canadians.

Put together two Canadians, an English Protestant and a French Catholic. How could they agree on that point? Clearly it is impossible. More information should be given to the English Protestant students; and better information ought to be available to the French Catholic student.

This is only an example amongst many, to show how differently History is taught to both Canadian groups. As long as we continue along those lines we will never meet. Yet we have to meet. It is the teachers' main duty to present history as it really is; it is also the common citizen's duty and interest to know the historical facts and to be able to discuss them intelligently, and in a friendly way. By doing this we Canadians will achieve much sooner National Unity.

"THE BIRTH OF A NATION"

An Address By

MARGARET AITKEN

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, March 3rd, 1949

Honoured Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In recent months an epic struggle has been going on in ancient Palestine, where the Jews have successfully fought to re-establish themselves in the land which was theirs in Biblical times.

I think the outcome of this struggle has been a surprise to the world and regardless of what viewpoint any one may hold, the courage and resourcefulness shown by the Jews in bringing the war to a successful conclusion cannot be overlooked by the historians.

We have all read much on this subject but today we are going to have the privilege of listening to an address from a trained observer who has just returned after spending several weeks in Palestine.

Our guest of honour, Miss Margaret Aitken, is known to all readers of the "Telegram" through her column "Between You and Me" which has been an outstanding feature of that paper for the past 8 years.

Miss Aitken was born in New Brunswick, completed her education at the University of Toronto, and as you all know, adopted journalism as her profession.

She has gone a long way as a columnist and feature writer and has been given many important assignments, such as the wartime conferences of Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt, a series of stories from Britain prior to "D" Day, the last election of President Roosevelt and more recently, the wedding of Her Royal Highness, the Princess Elizabeth.

During the past two months Miss Aitken has flown to Palestine and back; it sounds very simple, but in the process she actually landed in thirteen different countries, not all of which were on her itinerary.

Having read most of Miss Aitken's reports from Palestine, I am sure her address will be of outstanding interest.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Miss Margaret Aitken who has chosen as the title for her address "The Birth of a Nation."

Mr. Chairman, members of The Empire Club and fellow guests, it is a very great honour indeed for me to be standing here today.

For several years now, I have been a faithful attendant at The Empire Club—probably one of the Club's most faithful attendants. My appearance on all previous occasions has been in the more humble, and I might add, more comfortable position of reporter. I have reported the words of many speakers at this Club and now, to find myself standing here, instead of sitting at the Press table, is an experience both frightening and flattering. But mostly frightening. I shall enjoy it more in retrospect.

. . . .

I have just returned from one of the most interesting assignments any reporter could have. I have seen the birth of a Nation and it is about that new State—Israel—its people and problems, that I want to talk. In five weeks I covered every phase of the country—from Dan to Beersheba. I saw a people living their own history, hour by hour, day by day.

Alongside that living history was the ancient history of Biblical days. In Nazareth I saw where Jesus lived as a boy and where Mary, his Mother, cooked the meals he ate—Mary's Kitchen, it is called. In the Communal land settlements I saw modern dish-washing machines in the kitchens, along with other labor-saving devices.

In Jerusalem I saw deeply religious men, with caps on their heads and two long curls on each side of their heads (they are Polish Jews, of an old and strict cult)—these men were fashioning the beautiful diamonds that we associate with the more worldly side of life. Near Tel Aviv, at the Weizman Institute, I saw scientists fashioning modern precision tools and working on blueprints that will bring water from the Jordan down to the Negev desert. Near-by, I talked to an old man as he drew water from an ancient Biblical well—"It's dew from heaven," he said.

It is these contrasts, plus the amazing paradoxes and complexities of life in Palestine, that made my assignment such a fascinating one.

Ken McTaggart and I were the first Canadian correspondents to go to Israel since it proclaimed itself a Republic. As Canadians, we were given a warm welcome.

As a matter of fact, I found this same warmth toward Canada in all the 13 countries I landed in.

(I use the phrase "landed in" because that's exactly what I did. It was not my intention to visit 13 countries but airplanes are no respectors of one's intentions. You go with the wind, in a manner of speaking. I think my greatest surprise was to land in Iceland. I thought I was on my way to Newfoundland. I landed in Iceland where I stayed for 24 long, cold hours. Not even the aforementioned warmth, which I'm sure Iceland also feels toward Canada, was much help.)

. . . .

When I arrived in Palestine, the country was still torn asunder by war. There was a blackout and censorship and all the usual security measures that a country at war must observe. There were air raid alerts, which never amounted to much, but they added to the excitement. There were daily briefings, as to the war's progress. There was an atmosphere of tension but there was also an atmosphere of faith in ultimate victory, such as existed in Britain during World War 2.

The ordinary people appeared to have no doubts about the future. Despite the sacrifices demanded by war—and those sacrifices were mighty in physical comfort—the people were happy and vital and—what was most important to them—alive.

. . . .

But what amazed me about this little country of Palestine—what amazes everyone, including the Palestinian himself is not so much the war and victory but the complex situation of running a war and a wide-open immigration policy at the same time.

To welcome 10,000 refugees a month, as Israel is doing and has been doing since last June, and to carry on a full-scale war at the same time, is a project no other country would dare attempt.

There is no time to screen all these refugees—not from the security angle and not from the health angle. As a matter of fact, in some months as many as 40 percent of the 10,000 refugees have TB. There is no selectivity in Palestine's immigration policy. The old and the sick are as free to enter as the young and healthy.

What other country would dare take on such a load? For at least two decades, a great proportion of the people in Palestine will be a care to the Nation. They are broken in health and spirit. The Ghettos and concentration camps of Europe have made them permanent human wrecks.

How can Palestine do it?

I asked that question many times. "It is highly dangerous," the Military leaders said. "It is economic suicide," the Economists admitted. "It is impossible," the Politicians said.

Well, Palestine is doing the impossible.

But there was one answer that came to me again and again—"No alternative." Those two words add up to Israel's secret weapon in war and peace. It was "no alternative" that won the war and it will be "no alternative" that absorbs the broken, unhappy Jews of Europe. They have reached the promised land. There is no turning back, nowhere else to go. They must live in and for Israel or die. There is no other alternative.

. . . .

And it was "no alternative" that won the war for Israel too.

When the British gave up their Mandatory powers on May 15th, 1948, the Arabs immediately tried to move into all the strategic police stations which the British had built throughout Palestine. Whichever side held those fortified stations, held control of the entire country. Possession of the strongholds was essential to both sides. The Jews also tried to move into them and that was how the Arab-Jewish war really began.

But don't think the Jew wasn't frightened when the British moved out. The Arab Legion was supposed to be invincible and for more than a century Palestine had been a centre of conflict—tension, violence, bitterness—between Jew and Arab. But the British were there and both sides knew they had the protection of British justice behind them. Because of Britain's policy regarding immigration to Palestine, relations had grown strained between the Jews and the British but, the fact remains, the British WERE there and the British ARE just.

The Jews were frightened. They had no arms or army. They had no planes or tanks or ammunition but they also had "no alternative." They fought with their bare hands at first and they won.

So now, there is peace in Palestine. There is peace but I believe it will be a long, long time before conditions become settled and peaceful.

There are 400,000 Arabs who fled the country, clamouring to get back in. There are at least another 400,000 homeless European Jews waiting, with invincible hope and eagerness, to get into Palestine. There is a housing shortage in Israel to beat all housing shortages. There is a vast desert in the South to be irrigated and cultivated into fertile land. There are rocky, barren hills in the North to be cleared and cultivated.

I tell you, there's so much to be done in the Land of Israel, the mere thoughts of it all, leaves one in a state of breathless, wide-eyed wonder.

. . . .

One way in which the Jew has met one problem in Palestine is a way of life called the Kibutz. It is a form of land settlement, peculiar to Palestine, and it has been going on for about 40 years.

I visited several Kibutzim in Palestine—including the oldest one, which was established in 1909, and one of the newest, which was established in January, 1949. I want to tell you something of this way of life because it has and WILL play a most important and significant part in the development of Israel.

. . . .

The kibutz is built on idealism on the pioneer spirit, on an all-embracing communal life. It is something new in a social and economic order. It is also an attitude or approach to life that must be instilled in one.

I would hate the kibutz life, as I venture to say most of you here today would hate it—with its communal living, lack of privacy and subordination of the individual. But young Jews, and by that I mean mere children, in many parts of the world—including here in Canada and the United States—are trained to take up the life.

I attended one opening of a new kibutz which was two-thirds English Jews—young men and women from working class homes who had been trained in England to live the kibutz life.

It starts this way—A group of about 100 young people, in their late teens or early 20's, decide they want to form a kibutz. They apply to the Jewish Agency for land and money. They are immediately placed in old, established kibutzim where they train for five, six or seven years. Finally, the day comes when they are ready to form their own kibutz. The authorities give them perhaps 300 acres and 28,000 pounds, which is $84,000, and thenceforth, the kibutzers are on their own.

Tradition decrees that the group go upon the land cold, as it were. I use the word, "cold," in its slang sense, but I might add, it can be used in its literal sense as well. It was bitterly cold the day I went kibutzing and the stony, Galilee hills looked coldly uninviting.

We started at 5 o'clock in the morning, in a long convoy which carried all the worldly possessions of the entire group. By 3 in the afternoon they had their prefab living quarters up, their communal kitchen and dining room erected and their children's house or nursery on the way to completion. A married couple or a single person is allowed one room, no more, and the children live in their own house.

In these kibutzim a man owns no property, no money. He gets no wages and all workers are of equal importance. Men and women work as a collective group. Women share equally with the men in all work and all the profits. They work an 8-hour day. No more.

The kibutz motto is: "From each according to his capacity; to each according to his need." This motto, of course, is a straight steal from Karl Marx. But Kibutzim is not Russian Communism as we see it practised. Kibutzim is an idealistic, communal, non-political way of life.

The children of a kibutz are cared for by specially trained members of the group. The parents see their children between five and eight each evening but they have no actual care of them or family life as we know it.

Each member of the kibutz has one vote and every matter pertaining to life in the settlement is voted upon. Even in such matters as to whether a child should go to University is decided by the entire group—not by the parents of said child.

Well, that is life on a kibutz. Not my cup of tea but it has and IS answering Palestine's need. It is turning the Jew into a farmer. It is inspiring youth with the pioneer spirit. It is providing security, employment and living space to thousands of homeless Jews. In the not distant future it will turn the desert Negev and the stony Galilee hills into fertile farms.

Of all the things I saw and did in Palestine, the picture that will remain longest in my memory is the stark human emotion of the first Cyprus refugees as they sailed into Haifa Bay and reached out for the freedom they had endured so much to find.

When Britain announced that all the illegal immigrants were to be released, I went to Cyprus, on the ship which brought the first 1,500 refugees to Israel. They had been in the detention camp two years—behind barbed wire—waiting for freedom. I went through the camps—straggling rows of huts. I stepped over mud holes of stagnant water and every time I stopped to speak to anyone, I could feel a large, silent audience gathering around. These people were hungry for contact with the outside world. "A nightmare," they called Cyprus with its barbed wire. "A nightmare," which they wanted to forget as soon as possible.

I shall never forget the man who broke into hysterical cries as the ship left Cyprus.

"Give me back my 22 months," he cried to the British soldiers on the dock. "Give me back my 22 months."

The Cyprus episode was a tragic one and none were happier to see the end of it than the British. It is a terrible thing to see men and women caged behind barbed wire. I do not argue the rights or wrongs of the Cyprus episode. The illegal immigrants, as the very words indicate, defied the law. Britain had to take action and that action was Cyprus—instead of sending the refugees back to Europe. I only say, it is a tragic and terrible thing to see men and women behind barbed wire.

I shall never forget the faces of those 1,500 captives as our little ship sailed into Haifa Bay. The Jews had mustered everything that would float—including one Canadian-built Corvette, which they call their "fleet". There were dozens of flag-bedecked row boats—everything that would float was out to greet the refugees. Their reaction to this welcome was glorious to behold. All the bitterness and sadness, carved on their faces seemed to melt away.

And it was at this point that a typically British gesture melted away some of the bitterness in the hearts of those captive Jews.

There were three warships docked in Haifa Bay—an American, a French and a British—as the refugee ship sailed into port. As we passed the British ship, British sailors raised an Israeli flag alongside the Union Jack—in salute to the homecoming Jews. It was a lovely gesture, a sporting, friendly gesture which warmed the hearts of all Jews.

. . . .

Well, there it is, Mr. Chairman—my report on the birth of a Nation.

If you, ladies and gentlemen, were to ask, have I any one message to deliver, my answer is "Yes." And even if you don't ask—I am going to tell you that message.

My message is directed especially toward the Jews of North America. I say to them—and I say it in all sincerity and sympathy—Do not sit in your comfortable armchairs and tell the Israeli people what they should do or should not do. If you must give advice, go yourself to Palestine and see conditions there first. See the sacrifices and hardships the Israeli people have made and will continue to make in order to build a homeland for the Jews.

Do not preach militant Zionism from your peaceful country.

Do not incite discord between the Israeli people and the Briton or American or Canadian.

If you do these things, it is the greatest possible disservice you could do to the new Jewish Republic.

Above everything else, Israel needs peace and friends, And believe me, she needs the friendship of Britain. All the leaders I talked to in Palestine said the same thing. In the past, the Jew has had no better friend in the world than the Briton. That friendship must and WILL flourish again. But it will not flourish if you or I or those penthouse Johnnies in New York sow continual seeds of discord.

Israel needs peace. She needs friends. She needs British friendship. That is my message, ladies and gentlemen.

"THAT INFERIORITY COMPLEX"

AN ADDRESS BY

MERRILL DENISON, F.R.S.A.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, March 10th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

Today our guest of honour is Mr. Merrill Denison, famous Canadian-American, or if you wish American-Canadian. I say this advisedly because his mother came from United Empire Loyalist stock, and his father was of American Revolutionary stock.

While he lives part of the time in New York, he spends as many months in Canada as he does in the United States. Incidentally, his summer home is at Bon Echo, Ontario.

On one side of the border Merrill Denison is known as "A great American author"—on the other, "A great Canadian author." Perhaps it might be more accurate to describe him as "A citizen of North America."

Having established Mr. Denison's nationality beyond any shadow of doubt, we find further support of our conclusions when we consider his sources of income.

As a writer of magazine articles he is a contributor to "Harper's" and "The Atlantic Monthly" in the United States, and he is well-known in the "Toronto Star Weekly" here in Canada.

In the radio field he has written many series of broadcasts for networks in the United States and he wrote an important series of broadcasts for The Canadian National Railway and The Imperial Oil Company here in Canada.

As an author, he has written eight or nine books "Klondike Mike" was a "Book-of-the-Month." His latest book "Harvest Triumphant" which deals with the history of The Massey-Harris Company, has been an outstanding success in Canada and the United States, and is now being prepared for publication around the world.

As a playwright he has been most successful both in Canada and the United States. He also studied architecture at the Universities of Toronto and Pennsylvania, and after serving in the First World War, continued his studies at the University of Paris, France.

Having presented the evidence, gentlemen, I leave it to you to decide whether our guest of honour is a Canadian or American citizen.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Mr. Merrill Denison, F.R.S.A., who has chosen as the title for his address "That Inferiority Complex."

Mr. Chairman,

In addressing The Empire Club I do not feel that I am come among strangers. For some time during my career, in fact, I functioned in the somewhat unprofitable but nonetheless arduous position of the Club's second assistant secretary. This was due to the fact that my bride-to-be was first assistant secretary and to gain an audience with her I had to help out with the secretarial duties. She owed her position in turn to the fact that her father, Dr. D. J. Goggin, of honoured memory and one of the founders of this Club, was then secretary.

In spite of this fleeting, past association there seems to be some confusion among your executives as to whether I'm appearing before you as a homing Canadian, a visiting American, or one of those happily indecisive birds which are alternately praised for their independent spirit and damned for their schizophrenia—a mugwump. I sympathize with the executive in their confusion for I am often confused myself.

For example, at a meeting of the Canadian Authors Association not long ago I heard myself introduced in this fashion:

"Merrill Denison of New York is legally an American, having been born in Detroit instead of Windsor, but it was a close thing. Except for this incident beyond his control he is as much a Canadian as any of us."

Let me hasten to assure you that my birthplace was no accident any more than the event itself was any incident. Long before I even became embryonically involved in the project, my mother, for various reasons of her own, had resolved that I should breathe the free air of the Republic from the first, and went to considerable lengths to make good that resolution. There is hardly the time now to go into the involved influences that led her to such a curious decision but out of respect for them, an American citizen I've remained—to paraphrase Sir John A. Macdonald just a little.

However, my decision to remain an American seems to have had astonishingly little effect in making any the less Canadian . . . except, of course, in the matter of voting. I've lived alternately in both countries; been educated alternately in both and worked alternately in both. In general, I find myself somewhat more belligerently Canadian when in the United States than when in Canada and more determinedly American when in Canada than when in the United States. The reason, I suppose, is because I was born a child of protest and have gone on protesting ever since—against ignorance and intolerance and provincialism. If the truth could be determined, it would probably be discovered that I am wholly North American.

Having done little or nothing to clear up your confusion, I can now proceed to the subject of my discourse—"That Inferiority Complex." The reference, of course, is to the oft-repeated charge—or apologia—heard so often in connection with certain aspects of the Canadian mental climate. Fortunately, I am not only an authority on the inferiority complex but possibly one of the greatest living authorities. I don't claim to be the inventor of the famous cliche—some of the credit must be shared with Sigmund Freud—but I was probably the first to diagnose the symptoms and immortalize them on the printed page. That was when, for a brief period in its precarious existence, I served as the contributing editor of the Canadian Bookman.

I'd like to tell you something about the circumstances. After attending the Toronto public schools, Jarvis Collegiate and the University, I left Canada to continue my architectural training at the University of Pennsylvania, Columbia and finally Paris. I served with the French and American Armies during the First World War, and after the war started to practise architecture, first in Boston and then New York. That was fairly satisfactory for a couple of years, and then it began to dawn on me that I'd picked the wrong profession—for me, at least. Working in an office gave me claustrophobia, and I began to feel a terrible nostalgia for the Ontario backwoods, and the Big Rock at Bon Echo where I had spent all my boyhood summers. But there seemed to be no way to reconcile architecture and the backwoods until it suddenly dawned on me that I could give up architecture. I did so and immediately the question arose—what to do with my architectural skills—which were about the only ones I had. Fortunately, I knew something about the work being done at Hart House Theatre at Toronto University, and returned to become its art director.

I had been away from Canada virtually for seven years. I had seen other countries, come to know new people, and acquired a greater respect for Canada. In the French and American Armies, the valor of the C.E.F. had won a reputation unequalled by any other fighting force; in New York people had invariably regarded Canada and Canadians with admiration and neighbourly affection, and in my travels I had seen nowhere anything that could compare in natural beauty with the granite shores and blue waters of Bon Echo.

In New York I had heard that Hart House was one of the most interesting experimental theatres on the continent. That, indeed, it proved to be. Under the exciting, if sometimes erratic, directorship of Roy Mitchell, it drew to it many fine creative talents—painters, musicians, and people who responded to the magic of the theatre—from it should have radiated creative influences that could have enriched Canada's cultural life enormously. Some of these influences did radiate outward and their effects can be seen in many parts of Canada today—but never to the extent of their promise or potentialities.

As an outlander—in part at least—I sensed both the promise and its failure;—the promise in satisfaction that comes from worthwhile creative and co-operative efforts, the failure in the monumental apathy with which these efforts were generally received. In New York the vitality of the Hart House would have had the town agog: in Toronto it was meaningless except to a relatively small band of loyal adherents.

I wanted to know why and inevitably became interested in other aspects of Canadian cultural activity. Had such activities been wholly lacking, it would have been easy to dismiss Toronto as a provincial city, as indeed, many a Sunday visitor has done so bitterly. But most of the Toronto homes I knew were hung with pictures and had libraries filled with books. There was the University—an indubitable oasis of culture; the city boasted the greatest musical school—in point of student members—on any hemisphere; and had one of the finest public library systems to be discovered anywhere.

Here were evidences of healthy cultural appetites and of efforts to satisfy them. The curious thing was that so little of the fare offered seemed to be Canadian—neither the pictures on the wall, the books on the shelves, the lectures at the University, nor the music that floated out across University Avenue through the windows of the Conservatory.

This astonished me, for I had come to think of Canada as something eminently worth expressing. And it seemed to me that Canadians, at the close of World War I, with the achievements of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and their leading role in establishing the British Commonwealth behind them, should be as eager and able to express themselves—in books, pictures, music—as any people in the world. But it was quite evident that while the long struggle for political independence had been finally won, the struggle for spiritual and cultural independence was not yet even well begun.

Again I wanted to know the reasons. An experience at Hart House led me directly to an answer. One of the conditions under which the theatre was operated was that one bill of Canadian plays should be produced each season. It was not quite clear what a Canadian play might be and a year's search failed to disclose more than two one-act plays which seemed to come under possible classification and those mainly because they happened to be written by Canadians. It thereupon became incumbent upon either the director or myself to turn playwright to supply the missing third of an evening's entertainment. We tossed for it and I lost.

Since time had become peculiarly of the essence—the production was less than three weeks off—I had to decide quickly what a Canadian play might be—and write it. I settled the first question by concluding that a Canadian play should have something to do with Canadians in Canada. That gave rise immediately to another puzzling problem. What is a Canadian? Where does one find one? What does he look like; how does he act and react; what is distinctive about him? How does he differ from an American or an Englishman, a Scotsman or Irishman?

An American or British dramatist would not have been faced with the same problem or had to make the same pioneering effort—generations of novelists, playwrights, essayists had devoted themselves to exploring and delineating national traits and characteristics—to interpreting those peoples to themselves.

Why hadn't the same things taken place in Canada? Why had the development of a Canadian literature lagged so far behind other phases of Canadian development? A number of obvious answers presented themselves—geographic, political, economic, and so forth. But none of them seemed entirely satisfactory. If Canada could produce statesmen, lawyers, teachers, doctors, engineers, explorers, inventors, evangelists and moving picture stars —as she had in rich abundance—why couldn't she produce writers? The answer to that one was, of course, she had. But why hadn't they written about Canada--why hadn't they absorbed and communicated something of the immensity of her struggles and the wonder of her accomplishments?

The answer seemed to be that there didn't yet exist an audience in Canada ready to welcome things Canadian. Again why? With some assistance from Mr. Freud I came up with one possible diagnosis—an inferiority complex, an intellectual timidity born of a false feeling of inadequacy or inability. I expected that the impeachment would be promptly challenged and denied:—I never expected that it would become part of the national folklore and live to become a tedious and shop-worn cliche. For my sins, I have been doing my best to combat it ever since.

It was the desire to combat a sense of inferiority that mainly inspired my latest book *Harvest Triumphant*—the 100-year story of the Massey-Harris Company. It was written not to glorify a particular company but to present to Canadians the fascinating story of a little known but remarkable Canadian achievement.

I actually stumbled on the story almost by accident. I knew of Massey-Harris, of course, as who wouldn't who had ever pedalled a bicycle along the devil's strip on King Street out to Sunnyside or Diamond Park. I knew that the company claimed to be the largest makers of the farm implements in the British Empire but farm implements had never been numbered among my irrepressible enthusiasms. I had no idea, although I considered myself pretty familiar with every aspect of Canadian history, that here was a firm that was one of the world's great commercial undertakings or one that, in the course of the past fifty years, has contributed as much to the mechanization of agriculture as any other in the entire world.

At three times in its career this Canadian company had pioneered the technological advancement of farming—in the 1890's with the most efficient self binder ever manufactured; in the 1900's with the Reaper-Thresher, the first of the modern combines that reap, thresh, and clean grain automatically, and lastly with the fabulous self-propelled combine, which currently has placed Massey-Harris in the foremost rank of the world's farm implement industry.

In the United States, such contributions to material progress would have been proudly recognized as national achievements and made part of the lore of every school child—in Canada they remained unknown or ignored. I discovered them when I was commissioned to write the company's hundredth anniversary booklet. Poring through old records I was first amazed and then excited to learn of the part the firm had played not only in the mechanization of farming but in the development of the Canadian Northwest, in pioneering Canada's now gigantic export trade in manufactured articles and scores of other ways as well.

It was to communicate some of my excitement that I wrote *Harvest Triumphant*. In addition to recording and celebrating a great achievement, I intended the book to carry a simple message. Implicit in it is this statement: "See, my Canadian friends, here is what some of you have succeeded in accomplishing. Should you any longer harbor illusions of inferiority you can dispense with them forthwith."

Speaking as an American, nothing seems more ludicrous than the notion that Canadians-en-masse should harbor a sense of inferiority. Most Americans, I suspect, would be inclined to believe the opposite. So long as the Mounties never fail to get their man, number one Manitoba holds its world supremacy, and you periodically produce a Barbara Ann Scott—suggestions of inferiority will fall on ears across the border as a deliberate affectation.

Americans, of course,. are eternally charged with taking Canada for granted. For that they are not entirely to blame. The last reference to Canada in more than half the history textbooks used in American public schools is the year 1763. But any well informed American can retort, with equal truth, that Canadians are also prone to take Canada for granted—that most of them seem to take little or no interest in anything beyond the immediate and narrow limits of their daily lives. Where the American in general is responsive to every new development afoot in the United States—the Canadian in general remains aloof, reserved, disinterested in significant happenings within his country. To Americans, and I include myself again, this presents something of an enigma. —Why, when you have so much, do you make so little of it and seem to get so little fun out of it?

I don't pretend to know all the answers—although I've been seeking them ever since I can remember,—but I think one of the most acceptable is to be found in the most rewarding book that has yet come from the pen of a Canadian: Bruce Hutchison's *"Unknown Country"*. As Hutchison points out—Canada is still very largely an unknown country both to her own people and the strangers outside her gates.

In a fine opening passage he points up the great central theme of the Canadian story—the dramatic essence which gives its unique quality and heroic scale. Writing in 1944 he said: "Never have eleven and a half million people ventured so greatly, undertaken more, or accomplished more." With a simple variation in numbers the same truth holds good from the very dawn of Canada's beginnings.

No one who knows the Canadian story can fail to have his imagination kindled by the stature of the men who made it. Not the governors or the politicians—most of them seem to have been a dull and dreary lot—but the ordinary people—the men and women who succeeded against incredible odds in making Canada a nation—the anonymous integers who swelled the census rolls with painful slowness decade after decade.

Consider the restless courage that led a handful of irrepressible French romantics to embark on the discovery and conversion of an unknown content—the grim determination that built the Welland Canal with sweat and pick and shovel in six years time—(the population of Upper Canada was then less than 150,000)—the fantastic daring of the men who conceived and financed and built the Canadian Pacific Railway—the loyalties that compelled the Selkirk and later the first prairie settlers to sit out the dreary decades until technology and Clifford Sifton came finally to their rescue—of the mystical faith and fortitude needed to seek out the riches locked in the Laurentian Shield.

These and other engrossing dramas are part of the Canadian saga. Even more remarkably, in the process of mastering their physical environment, Canadians have been notable innovators, initiators, true pioneers in other important areas of human activity. The Northwest Mounted Police was their invention and from that body stems every non-urban police organization on the continent. The Ontario Hydro Power Commission was their creation and the inspiration for the Tennessee Valley Authority and other social developments of a like nature. The swift evolution of air transport was largely of their doing and today the air lift to Berlin can be traced back step by step directly to the northern bush pilots of a quarter century ago.

These are but some of the highlights of a continually fascinating story. Yet few Canadians seem to be aware of them or else they remain untouched by their significance. Why? The answer lies in part at least in the failure to develop a Canadian literature which will first communicate, then celebrate national achievement in exciting and engrossing terms.

National consciousness, you know, is not transmitted through the genes or chromosomes. It is an intellectual concept acquired from literary preachment. How explain Canada's outpouring of blood and treasure in two world wars if it was not in response to the love of Britain engendered by her poets, dramatists, ballad writers and novelists. How, without *Punch*, could the British ever have come to imagine themselves a modest, reticent, unassuming people —or we Americans, without the *Saturday Evening Post* and Hollywood, to imagine ourselves inventors of virtually everything on earth?

But the failure to develop an important body of Canadian literature is due to an even more fundamental failure.

And please don't think that I undervalue the steps that have already been taken in that direction by Canada's writers or the discouragements they have had to overcome —the duality of language, the smallness of the population, the magnetic attraction of the larger American market. . . The more fundamental failure, it seems to me, lies in the mistake of not teaching Canadian history as it has actually happened..

No school children anywhere, surely, were ever made to suffer such pains of compounded boredom as are young Canadians in wrestling with the false confusions of what has been made to seem their dull and unexciting past. As it was taught in my day—and I've reason to suspect it's pretty much the same today—Canadian history was without a single affirmation that would make one proud to be Canadian.

The French period, of course, is so colorful and romantic that only a great talent could destroy it and the textbook writers were not distinguished by great talent. But with the Conquest, life suddenly departs from the story and from that point it plunges into the labyrinth of constitutional history and developments. Along its dull and tortuous paths most school children pass out somewhere between the Constitutional Act of 1791 and the Act of Union of 1841. Should their waning interest survive these bewildering events, then the confusions of Confederation or those of the Manitoba School question will surely down them anyway.

Again one wonders why. Alongside those of Britain and the United States, the story of Canada's constitutional development is relatively uninteresting to anyone but students of government and constitutional lawyers. The story of the Canadians' success—with their infinitesimal population—in retaining and developing half a continent on the other hand, is one of the great human dramas of history. How account, then, for the fact that the one is stressed beyond all reasonable need and the other virtually ignored? The answer, it seems to me, must lie in the fact that Canadian history textbooks are written entirely from a colonial point of view, in which the desire to emphasize the British attachment has made necessary the adoption of an amazing fiction—that Canada came into being in a geographic vacuum, as completely divorced from American influence as if the countries were on different planets.

This represents an extraordinary indifference to fact. The inter-relationships and economic inter-dependencies of the two countries, together with their political independencies of each other, make one of the world's most interesting phenomena and the undefended border one of the most important factors in Canada's pact. As a safety valve it has saved you from the explosive effects of pent-up, economic and political pressures and it has played the same dominant role in the moulding of the Canadian character as the frontier has in the American. To pretend that events beyond that border have had little or no influence on Canada's development is as preposterous as insist that the people who live beyond it have always harbored a sinister desire to annex Canada. Nothing, probably, could do more to foster an inferiority complex than the myth of annexation.

It's only necessary to step across the border into American history to establish the wholly mythological character of the annexation bogey. In the war of 1812, on the eve of the Battle of Queenston Heights, thousands of American troops refused to enter the boats that were to take them across the Niagara River because they had no desire to fight on Canadian soil. When the Montreal signers of the Annexation Manifesto of 1849 reached Washington they were told that the South would never countenance the addition of a large group of Northern states—And the same proposition holds true to this day. There has never been a remote desire for annexation among Americans—and so long as there remains two or three Southern senators with the strength to filibuster, I doubt if Canada could fight her way into the Union with fixed bayonets.

You may ask why I should be so concerned about the subject of Canadian Nationalism—for that is what I am talking about. I am obviously an internationalist. In general, I regard nationalism as a malevolent and disruptive force. I believe in the aims and purposes of the United Nations and I am a supporter of Federal Union. As a preliminary step I would indorse the adoption of dual citizenship between Canada and the United States with the right to vote based solely on residence qualifications. Why, then, am I such a devout advocate of Canadian Nationalism?

I suppose the reason is that as a devoted step-child I wish to see my foster parent realize to the fullest extent her magnificent potentialities. Despite prodigious accomplishments in so many fields, she still lacks many of the cultural appreciations and expressions that enrich life in less fortunate countries. As examples, I cite the lack of a national library; the timid applause for the works of her artists, musicians, writers until they have won recognition outside the country; the general imperviousness to the architectural ugliness of the great majority of Canadian towns and cities.

In many respects Canadians are more to be envied than any people in the world. Your ratio of population to resources is probably in better balance than that of any other country. You have not been too intelligent in the exploitation of those resources—particularly the forests—(They are not as "unlimited" as some advertising would lead one to believe)—but there is still time to place them on a sustained yield basis. Furthermore, Canada now stands on the threshold of a period of fabulous development—an inevitable consequence of the discovery of new reserves of oil and iron as those of the United States approach forseeable exhaustion.

Along with this increased economic strength should come cultural attainments that will make the creative expressions of the Canadian mind and spirit as easily recognized as those of her pulp mills and her factories. Such a fruition depends very largely on the awareness and leadership of organizations such as The Empire Club. I hope you will embrace your opportunities. I count on spending quite a lot of the future here and I'd like to enjoy every moment of it. I would be glad to see the end of that inferiority complex.

. . . .

THANKS BY MAJOR MOORE

MR. PRESIDENT, GENTLEMEN:

The frequency with which I bob up at this table must clearly indicate to you that the title of Mr. Denison's address in no wise applies to me.

As I listened to the President's introduction and to the opening passages of Mr. Denison's remarks I realized how much easier it is for presidents and speakers on the other side of the line to establish a guest's racial origin. In the United States the immigration law makes it all delightfully simple. If you are born in a stable you are a horse. And that's all there is to it.

To what we have heard may I add that, to my knowledge, Mr. Denison has performed a valuable service to Canada by journeying through the United States and presenting to our cousins there the story of this country and its people.

Today we have listened to an address delivered with such delicate lightness of touch, and yet with such depth of penetration, as to make it one of the most memorable experiences we have enjoyed over a considerable period of time.

May I trade upon the name of Mr. Denison's summer home in Canada and be the Good Echo of the feeling I know is shared by every member of this Club present here today, and say on their behalf—thank you.

"WE TAKE OUR STAND"

AN ADDRESS BY

DR. F. CYRIL JAMES,
B.Com., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., D.C.L.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, March 17th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

This is the third occasion that The Empire Club has been honoured in having Dr. F. Cyril James, Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University as its guest and speaker.

When Dr. James addressed us in February, 1941, he chose as his subject "Inflation and War Finance" which was a frank discussion of the dangers of monetary inflation in time of war.

In February, 1948, his subject was "Money Makes the Mare to Go." That was a strong plea for reconstruction of world affairs within the framework of an efficient international monetary system and was in a sense a sequel to his first address.

Today Dr. James has chosen as the title for his address, "We Take Our Stand." I can think of many things which this might embrace, but having no prior knowledge of the theme of Dr. James' address, I am only prepared to prophesy one thing and that is that we are about to listen to an outstanding address.

Dr. James has had a unique and remarkable career. Born in England, he graduated from London University. Came to America and studied the economic structure of the United States at the University of Pennsylvania and in the fall of 1939, was appointed Principal of McGill University. In that position his exceptional ability as an educator has brought him great prestige and distinction.

It now gives me very great pleasure to introduce Dr. F. Cyril James, B.Com., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., D.C.L.

It may be rash, if rumour is credible, to speak about St. Patrick in Toronto. It has sometimes been suggested that this city is peopled by Orangemen, to whom all saints are anathema, but I would suggest to you that St. Patrick provides us, across many centuries, with a most appropriate exemplar for these days in which we are living. The man is worthy of our memory.

It was in the West of Britain, somewhere between the Clyde and the Bristol Channel, that Patrick first saw the light of day in 387 A.D. Memory does not easily depict that period for us. It is later than the period covered by our high school Latin and long before the remembered 1066 of William the Conqueror. Yet it was an interesting period. Britain had been a Roman province for more than two hundred years; it was the western outpost of that great world civilization which has transmitted to us much of our concept of law and no small part of our ideals of personal liberty and responsibility.

Stephen Vincent Benet's *The Last of the Legions* might help us to visualize the environment of St. Patrick. His home town lay not far behind the Roman Wall: It was near the frontier, where civilization faced the pagan barbarity of the Picts and Scots. Men should have realized daily in such a place that life, liberty and the Christian faith were precious. They could be preserved as long as men had strength and courage enough to defend the Wall. No longer. Patrick's father was a decurion, a municipal councillor; his mother had come from the Roman province of Gaul. They knew the value of their heritage, and we can be sure that young Patrick was trained in a household that worshipped God as sincerely as it appreciated the fact that it was a part of that great and uniform civilization, policed by the Roman legions, and subject to the Roman law which stretched from the outposts of Dumbarton and Chester, across Rome and the Mediterranean, to distant Egypt and Arabia. The dark pattern of barbarian life beyond the Wall was but a shadow to make familiar light more brilliant by its contrast.

But Patrick was born in a time of the breaking of nations. Far off in the Balkans, the Emperor Theodosius was fighting the usurper Maximus. The heart of the Empire was torn by civil war and weakened by the spirit of secession. Distant provinces like Britain were being drained of their manpower by the wars, and when they looked to Rome for strength and leadership none was forthcoming.

Civilization was crumbling in the face of barbarism; the process was slow and continuous. The lamps grew dimmer year by year but there was no sudden catastrophe in which the light went out.

Three generations before Patrick was born the people of the towns began to "take to the woods" in order to avoid taxation and that personal responsibility for government which had been the tradition of Rome. When his father was a young man, in 360 A.D., the barbarians had swept across the Wall, and the cities of Britain were scarcely able to defend themselves during the weeks that elapsed before Rome could send from Gaul (itself made up of trained barbarian mercenaries) a mobile force to drive the invader back. The historian of that episode remarks that "the settled legions were no longer well disciplined, nor were they trustworthy"—an ominous portent of coming doom!

I wonder how much young Patrick thought about these things. It would be fascinating for us of this generation to have a first-hand record of the disintegrating society: of municipal buildings falling into disuse and disrepair, of municipal government become an empty farce because men were too lazy to govern themselves. But there was scant time for the lad to philosophise. He was not much more than fifteen when Irish raiders from across the narrow seas swooped down on the British coast to plunder a town that was too wealthy to be safe, yet too indolent to realize its danger. He was taken captive to Ireland, and as a slave assigned to the task of tending the domestic animals of his barbarian captor.

Few great men have had a less promising apprenticeship; but during those six years he dreamed dreams as he walked the lonely hills, and saw the waters that stretched endlessly eastward toward the land of his birth. "The spirit of the Lord was warm in me", he wrote in the *Confession* penned in after life. There are in our literature many stories of the exile who dreamed of home. You do not need me to describe his thoughts, if you will use your imagination; and that imagination will also paint for you the joy of St. Patrick and of his family when, after six years, he was able to escape from bondage and rejoin them.

His father and mother were still alive. Perhaps the quality of Roman civilization had weakened a little year by year during his absence, but the joy of homecoming was so great that he could easily be excused if he had no taste for detailed sociological or political observations. This was the city life of which he had dreamed. His parents were alive and well. He had come home again!

I suppose that many a British lad, in those troubled years of the fifth century, suffered a similar fate. Raids were frequent, because the defences were poor. Some of the captives, no doubt, died in exile; Patrick was lucky to get home again.

But today we do not recall his luck: we think about his courage and determination. There would be no festival today, fifteen centuries after his lifetime, if he had been content to grow old in his family villa, telling his cronies beside the winter fire about his early experiences and complaining of the sad decline in the quality of the municipal services.

Patrick was not, however, content to slide back into comfort and leave the battle to the other man. He was not even of that band, immortalized in the tragic memory of General Maginot, who think it adequate to stand comfortably on the defensive when society is threatened. Perhaps it was even then too late to defend the Wall. The barbarians had already broken through in the east and swept down to York. But even if military action was no longer practical, Patrick could remember that the ideals and traditions of Rome in the hearts of its citizens had once been more powerful than its legions. Arnold Toynbee has emphasized the fact that a civilization spreads more by the force of its ideas than by the strength of its weapons. It was still possible to take the offensive in that last and hardest of all campaigns—the effort to convert the enemy to an understanding of the great traditions of Roman civilization.

Do you think that idea fantastic? Friends and family tried hard to dissuade young Patrick from his foolish idea of going back to Ireland to convert the heathen. Why run into danger when he was safe? But Patrick knew that safety was not to be found in isolation. "I could not act contrary to my view . . . I yield to none." Here I must take my stand; I can do none other!

It was in 432 A.D. that St. Patrick returned to Ireland, this time by his own free will, and there he worked steadily until his death in 461 A.D. I shall not recount that mission. But it is worth remembering that St. Patrick accomplished more than he could have dreamed possible when he set out. He not only converted many Irishmen to Christianity and a knowledge of western civilization he founded the great Celtic Church that, four centuries later, was able to send missionaries to those peoples of England and Europe who had lost all contact with the ancient civilization and fallen under the heel of pagan barbarism. His attack was, in the long run, the most magnificent defence.

We live in a moment of this world's history when it is good to remember men who were not defeatists. The pillars of our civilization have not yet cracked as badly as those which upheld Roman society in St. Patrick's day; but if we are honest with ourselves we realize that they are less solid than they were a generation ago. A man need not be old to remember the time when there was a free democratic parliament in Prague, and the name of Masaryk was a beacon to our thoughts. It is not long since

Hungarians danced joyously to the strains of a Tzigane orchestra whose music contrasts sadly with that last prayer of Cardinal Mindszenty—surely one of the strangest pleas that any judge in a criminal court ever heard from the lips of a prisoner: "God give peace in these days, not for the future, or the distant future, but in these days." There are men living, and not yet old, who can remember when a Duma was sitting in St. Petersburg and Russia was on the way toward constitutional monarchy.

These are the milestones of memory. In remembering them we realize how far we have fallen from the bright hopes that were ours a generation ago. The "Iron Curtain" is not, like the ill-fated Maginot line, the fixed outer defence of a frightened people with no taste for the fighting that might be necessary to defend their possessions and ideals. The "Iron Curtain" is a moving screen, like those fantasies of the Arabian Nights: it advances steadily, and the advance guard of the Kremlin moves ahead of it.

Soviet tactics have changed many times since 1917. A strong dictatorship does not need to be consistent; it does not need to explain to its people the frequent reversals of its stated foreign policy, because those people are not allowed to know anything of foreign policy, and a close censorship keeps them ignorant of what is going on in other parts of the world. Soviet politicians can therefore resort to wheedling persuasion when they think it may be more effective than force to attain their long-range strategic aims. But those strategic aims have been consistent.

The post-war phase of Soviet tactics began with Stalin's public speech in January, 1946, when he announced to the world that there could be neither peace nor prosperity in a world that was half-capitalist and half-communist. We should understand that, and agree with it, remembering that Abraham Lincoln said it clearly three generations ago. The directors of Russian policy might have abandoned the old idea of spontaneous world revolution but they were still pressing forward relentlessly on the basis of their new slogan: "Socialism country by country." The Cominfórm was created as an international organization to replace that Comintern which had been ostentatiously destroyed when Russia needed western aid to strengthen its defences against Germany. Communism is once again on the march—and you can remember that it has achieved no small success in central Europe and in Asia during the past three years.

This is still the official Russian policy. Mr. Harry Pollitt, Chairman of Executive Committee of the Communist Party in England, and memorable for his vacillations whenever Moscow calls the tune, has recently issued to his followers a directive that is enlightening; and I should like you to ponder carefully the significance of the following orders, which I quote verbatim:

> "1. End the present war policy of the Anglo-American Bloc and the Western Bloc; strengthen the struggle for peace.
>
> 2. Reduction of armaments and armed forces; prohibition of the atom bomb.
>
> 3. Friendship with Soviet Union and People's Democracies; independence for all colonial peoples.
>
> 4. Close trading relations with the Soviet Union, People's Democracies and liberated peoples; end one-sided economic dependence on the United States.
>
> 5. Bring the nationalized industries under effective democratic control; extend trade union and co-operative participation in economic control.
>
> 6. Raise wages and social standards, including old-age pensions and social benefits.
>
> 7. Cut prices and limit profits; shift the burden of taxation to the rich.
>
> 8. Extend the social services, health and education provision; speed up the housing programme, build 400,000 houses a year.
>
> 9. Full democratic rights for the working class and the banning of fascism."

Can you conceive of anything more specious—and more dangerous—at this time? Let us quarrel with our friends, and weaken our own country by internal squabbles about new luxuries which it cannot afford! In every other nation — in France, in Italy, and in the United States, communist leaders are trying hard to breed friction among the nations and discontent among the people at home.

This policy continues, but Russia seems officially to be talking less belligerently than she did a year ago. Why? The available evidence suggests one simple reason: the Kremlin has received a shock as a result of the response of the western nations to its talk of war. The Marshall Plan has done much to strengthen the weaker democratic peoples. The airlift at Berlin has demonstrated not only the airpower of the west but the fact that western peoples are willing to resist Russian aggression. The North Atlantic Pact and the Western European Defence Force which is being organized under General Montgomery have indicated that western democracies will stand together in the day of Armagedden and not repeat the tragic mistake of allowing small countries to be over-run, one at a time.

Russia has not modified her strategic ambitions. But Russia is not yet ready for war. The men of the Kremlin would like to lull us to sleep with fair words, so that they may once again steal the initiative. If we respond to such blandishments, we do so at our peril. Eternal and continuing vigilance is the price of liberty; and if we are to defend those traditions of civilization which are common to all western democracies, we must work as hard and fight as single-mindedly as the Russians.

Do you remember that "Bloody Question" which was the challenge of man to man in England as the Armada drew near? The soldiers of Spain were on the sea, and the Inquisition was to be given an opportunity of curbing the Englishman's unpleasant habit of thinking for himself. Catholic and Protestant were at one another's throats in half the countries of Europe. But the English challenge was not "Are you Protestant or Catholic?" The "Bloody Question" was simple: "If the Armada comes, will you fight for England, or for Spain?"

Because Russia is not yet prepared, there is no Armada at our doors, but the reference to military defence is not inappropriate. There is already fighting at the outposts. Some of you may have read the story in TIME magazine of the little village of Naousa in the northern hills of Greece. You will remember how this little village, happy in the escape from starvation which the Marshall Plan had provided, was stormed by communist bandits, its mayor shot, and many of its young people taken into captivity in order to teach the village not to associate with the democratic powers. The story could be repeated a hundred times in regard to communities in that uncertain area of no man's land which stretches on the western side of the Iron Curtain, in Europe, and ahead of the communist armies in the east.

If we mean to defend our liberties, if we are willing to take the offensive, as we in this quiet sanctuary of North America insist that we are, it is important that we defend our outposts with all the forces at our command. We cannot afford to betray ourselves in the house of our friends; and men exposed to the immediate menace of communist forces in Europe or in Asia must be pardoned for their willingness to make terms with the enemy if we of the democracies do not convince them that all our material strength and manpower is available for their defence today and during all the days that follow. We cannot exhort with empty words and theories a man whose life and family is in immediate danger.

This we must do generously, and do at once. It is no good sending economic subsistence without providing defence. Each believer in democracy who is stood up against a wall, and shot, weakens our cause. We lose a valiant fighter, and create the feeling of weak uncertainty in many minds. Do you remember the words of that old, bereaved woman in Naousa when the representatives of the western powers arrived, on the day after the massacre? "You must put an end to this war, or else leave us to the Russians. Between you, we are being crucified."

Certainly we must defend the outposts. But we must do more than that. The collapse of the Roman civilization came from the weakness of those who should have defended it, not from the strength of the attackers. Rome had resisted the barbarian for hundreds of years, but in the words of St. Chrysotom (who saw the collapse), "Cities are not only taken when men demolish the walls, kill the men, enslave the women and burn the houses. Where there is indifference to all that is noble and a passion for ignoble ends; when men and women devote their time to dancing . . . games, gambling (and spectacles), that is the ignominious sack of a town." In the words of a stalwart contemporary, General Omar Bradley, we must be willing to "do the chores" in our own homes and our own communities if we really want to save democracy.

This, gentlemen, is a time when we must revive, as a daily challenge to ourselves and to others, the "Bloody Question". I am not suggesting a philosophical enquiry into liberalism, let alone an intensification of the current vague mania for "red-baiting", with its tendency to label every liberal thinker as a communist. We need men and women who ask questions honestly about the standard pattern of our habits. Those are the questions that inspire reform and progress. The Elizabethans did not waste time on detailed discussions of hagiology and doctrine. We must be equally blunt. Will you fight for Russia, or for Canada? Are you a member of the Communist Party, adhering to the cause of a foreign power, or do you support with your whole heart the democratic system? Choose your side. There can be no middle ground.

Before some of us in this room have grown old that question may be as literal as it was to the Elizabethans; but even at this moment the sincerity of our answer is vitally important to our future welfare. It imposes responsibilities. We must defend the distant outposts of democracy as doggedly as we would defend our own hearths. We must supply economic sustenance to our friends; and it is already time for us to consider what we are prepared to do in 1952, when the present magnificent programme of the Marshall Plan comes to an end. But we must do more than that. The strength of democracy is in ourselves, and somebody suggested the other day that each of us must now enlist in the W.A.C.W.—the Western Army of the Cold War. The advice is trenchant: we need a democratic antidote to the Cominform. There cannot be conscription, because conscription in such a spiritual struggle is repugnant to the fundamental idea of democracy. Enlistment must be voluntary. But the decision to enlist follows directly from the answer that each individual makes to the question I have just posed. If western civilization is to survive during the generations that lie ahead, it is necessary that its defenders should enlist promptly, and serve with whole-hearted enthusiam.

The responsibilities of those who enlist in the W.A.C.W. are simple, but they are not easy. The strength of our democratic civilization lies in men's hearts, not in their weapons. The spirit of freedom that nerves the arm and evokes outstanding courage is more important than the atom bomb. It is the profound sense of our liberties—and of our responsibilities—that makes us free men and strengthens the society of which we are a part. Every man and woman who enlists in the W.A.C.W. must augment that strength:—

In the first place, we must undertake, as individuals, to do our share in the work of government, locally, provincially and nationally. That certainly involves honest, consistent and conscientious voting at the polls, but it involves more than that. It involves a willingness to do the chores, to accept office and responsibility, whether inadequately paid or totally unpaid, and it implies that we shall not slothfully leave the work of government to other people and salve our conscience by dismissing them as "politicians", and assumed to be less capable, made of grosser clay, than ourselves.

In the second place, we must undertake to work with all that we have in us for the welfare of the world, and not lazily to think that the world owes us a living because we are fortunate enough to have our domicile in such a wealthy country as Canada. Politics and economics are not separate. Food, clothing, shelter, are the essentials of life; and any careful observer knows that the supply of these funamental goods in many parts of the world is inadequate to maintain a decent standard of living. If we want men to have the leisure to think, and to cultivate the beauties of life, we must help them to attain a standard of living that does not require them to use all of their slight energies to scratch their daily food from the ground. It is no good telling a starving Chinese coolie about the glories of personal liberty. If we would encourage men and women in the poorer countries of the world to believe that the democratic peoples are eager to provide for all mankind a high standard of living, we must conscientiously work with all our might in order to help supply the deficiencies of less well situated people. This is no time for a holiday—not even a "memorial" one of the kind inspired by Mr. John L. Lewis; and our enemies in the Kremlin understand fully the fact that hard work and abstinence from consumption will go far to determine the success in the coming fight. They would not argue long with trade union leaders, even if any could be resurrected from Siberia or their untimely graves. There was never so much work to do; and no individual with the vision to understand democracy and the courage to advance its cause, can face his conscience with a valid excuse for loafing.

In the third place, we must try to think for ourselves, honestly and courageously—seeking always to find solutions to the many problems that confront the world. It would be well, as I have suggested on earlier occasions, if more of us understood the Russian language and the Russian way of life—so that we might appraise more accurately the policies of our adversary. It would be well if we also spent more time and energy studying the details of our own Canadian scene, with a view to building upon our traditions a steadily improving democracy. We must never cease from striving.

Simple things, these, but fundamental to the welfare, and indeed to the continued existence, of our civilization. *Democracy is the opportunity to accept responsibility.* It can be kept alive only by our individual efforts, and we should, at our peril, abandon our individual responsibility in order to leave its defence solely to the armed forces, or even to the members of Parliament.

Whether a fighting war will come, and when it might come, I do not pretend to know. But the evidence clearly indicates that it will come swiftly and suddenly if we allow ourselves to fall, once again, into that state of mutual suspicion and irresponsibility which characterized the western world during the 'thirties. Our own complacency at this moment is more dangerous than the vociferous arguments of Communists within our doors. They are not numerous. They can be rendered innocuous if we have the courage to face this problem squarely. But I do not think that repressive tactics alone will solve our problem. We must, by our enthusiasm for human liberties and the principles of democracy, develop a new purpose, and give new meaning to life, in the democratic countries. We must persuade the stranger beyond our gates by demonstrating continually that we live up to the principles that we preach, and that the friendship of democratic countries is something to be richly prized for more than economic reasons. We must stand fast, in the confidence that our traditions are good and that our spirit of freedom must surge onward to advance the welfare of all mankind. We must take the offensive on all fronts, and maintain it.

May I return to St. Patrick for a moment? You will remember the story of his arrival at Tara on the afternoon of the great midwinter festival of the Druids. The sun was sinking, men feared in their ignorance that it might be dying, never to return. The fires on every hearth were extinguished. At black midnight, a great pyre would be lit so that its sympathetic magic might bring new life to the sun, and agricultural prosperity for another year.

All of Tara was in darkness that evening—except one house, where St. Patrick and his few followers sat around their little fire. It was that fire which attracted the attention of the King, and caused him to send for St. Patrick, to explain the reasons for his disobedience. It was that fire, and a courageous man, that rekindled the light of Christian civilization in the western islands. It is an outward fire, and an inward courage, which we need today, not only to win the cold war but to make possible the continued march of human progress. We must take the offensive.

"THE IRON CURTAIN AND THE SILVER SCREEN"

An Address By

FRANCIS S. HARMON, LL.B.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, March 24th, 1949

Honoured Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a generally accepted fact that what one sees makes a more lasting impression on the human mind than what one hears. When you combine these two methods of communication, as in the motion picture, it is easy to visualize the powerful propaganda agency which the movies can be.

Our guest of honour, Mr. Francis S. Harmon, Vice-President of the Motion Picture Association of America, has chosen as the title of his address "The Iron Curtain and the Silver Screen", which suggests that he may have something to say about Russia. We can well imagine the importance which is attached to moving pictures as propaganda, both inside Russia and elsewhere.

Mr. Harmon was born in Mississippi, served in the first world war and on his return graduated from Harvard Law School. He then became Assistant Attorney General in his native State and later editor and publisher of a daily newspaper. Mr. Harmon was elected President of the National Y.M.C.A. in 1929 and two years later became head of the International Committee of the Y.M.C.A. of the United States and Canada, in which capacity he travelled throughout North America, Europe and Asia.

Our speaker first became associated with the motion picture industry in 1937 as Executive Assistant to the

President of the Motion Picture Assocations of America. He served as liaison officer between the industry and the United States Government during the war and in this capacity was closely associated also with John J. Fitzgibbons in aiding Canada's war effort. It was through Mr. Harmon that the War Finance Committee at Ottawa received such splendid co-operation from the Motion picture industry.

I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Francis Stuart Harmon, Vice-President of the Motion Picture Association of America and Vice-President of the Motion Picture export Association.

Mr. Harmon:—

Mr. President, fellow members of the world community of nations, my friends of the motion picture industry:

That was an exceedingly gracious introduction from the lips of your President. An added touch which I appreciated came from Colonel Bennett outside the door of this room when he handed me a few moments ago this sealed package here which I understand is a printed volume containing the speeches of my predecessors on your program.

Believe me, I was not treated in such a genteel fashion two weeks ago when I addressed a club in New York City. The secretary of that organization, a good friend of mine, is accustomed to write up the minutes of the preceding annual meeting in an inimitable style which is strictly his own. Just prior to my introduction, instead of being given a sealed copy of previous speeches, I had to listen while the secretary read aloud his minutes in which he panned repeatedly and unmercifully, the speaker of the year before. Amid roars of laughter and much applause his minutes were unanimously adopted. Then as the master of ceremonies began his introduction, several people started walking out of the room.

Their hasty exit reminded me of another occasion when a war buddy of mine was introduced at the fag end of a long, long program. People began to go out, not in ones and twos, but in coveys as we say in the quail country from which I come. The distraught master of ceremonies leaped to his feet and exclaimed "Wait a minute! Don't you know who this fellow is? He went through hell for us on the other side and it's up to us to do as much for him here today!" So you see, in the light of past experience, I can and do genuinely appreciate the very gracious introduction and cordial reception accorded me today.

Frankly, I feel very much at home speaking to an audience anywhere in Canada. For 5 years as the head of the International Committee of Y.M.C.A.'s of Canada and the United States, mine was the rare privilege of talking to audiences throughout North America about this merging world community in which we live and the responsibilities and opportunities which world citizenship entails.

Another real satisfaction in coming to Canada is that of renewing memorable wartime associations with friends and colleagues here. Your President mentioned the close relationship which existed during the war years between Mr. Fitzgibbons and his excellent motion picture committee—Don Henshaw and your Government officials—and our own War Activities Committee of the Motion Picture Industry in the United States.

To show you how I really feel about Canada and Canadians and how my associates in the United States feel about you, let me cite one wartime illustration. We provided 43,189 motion picture prints of feature pictures on 16 mm film without any change whatever for the entertainment of members of the armed services of the United States in combat areas overseas. I wrote a letter to a high ranking officer in Washington stating that although this gift was made officially to the armed services of the United States, any Canadian unit anywhere in any combat area was entitled to exhibit these same films on precisely the same no-charge basis as for men and women wearing the uniform of the United States of America.

During the past 18 months the film industries of our two countries, and more particularly the representatives of your Government and of our industry, have developed an unique pattern of co-operation which has achieved notable results.

I arrived in Toronto today just a few hours after an important announcement of the relaxing of Canada's austerity program. Mr. Fitzgibbons and myself remember another trip of mine to Canada just a few days after the austerity program was begun. It was not at all certain then whether or not an undiminished supply of Hollywood motion pictures which Canadian patrons wanted to see and which we were anxious to provide for your theatres, could continue to cross the line. How easy it would have been at that time when you were hard pressed for dollars for your top officials to have followed the conventional bureaucratic routine and invoked the old stereotypes—bans, quotas, frozen funds—the vicious circle our distributors have come to know so well in other countries!

Instead—thanks to an imaginative approach on the part of your key men in Ottawa—we were able to work out a program which has kept films moving from Hollywood studios to Canadian screens; a program which has brought dollars from Canada to Hollywood to help pay the cost of making these same pictures; and also a program which has materially increased the volume of United States tourist dollars accruing to Canada, thereby enabling you to pay us. In Hollywood this mutual aid plan is called "The Canadian Co-operation Project". Let me outline briefly just how the plan works.

In 1947 Canada received $241,000,000 from American tourists. Last year the total was up to 270 million United States dollars—an increase of 29 million dollars. This *increase* of 29 million dollars was more than twice the sum remitted to Hollywood to finance Canada's share of the production cost of 435 feature length pictures.

At the inception of the project I ventured to tell a group of your national officials that if we were given the opportunity we could help materially to increase tourist business in Canada. We were given this opportunity. We worked closely and, I believe, effectively with your Tourist Bureau and your Department of Trade and Commerce in stimulating an ever-growing stream of American vacationists to visit your beautiful land of lakes and mountains. We released 12 films on United States' screens each of which was devoted in whole or in part to a portrayal of Canada's beauties and attractions in summer and in winter. We also produced and released a rather serious film titled NEIGHBOUR TO THE NORTH which, through excellent dialogue, effective picturization and exceedingly good animation, summarized in an interesting fashion the trade and dollar problem confronting Canada in her relationships to Britain and to the United States. Some 40 million movie-goers in my country will see NEIGHBOUR TO THE NORTH in some 12 thousand theatres and gain a clear understanding of triangular trade and foreign exchange.

We got 13 top-flight Hollywood stars to make recordings about Canada which were used on 400 radio stations in the United States along with musical programs of your Leslie Bell Singers. Each of these stars stressed some important fact about Canada on each of these recordings. Mr. Rupert Lucas representing the C.B.C. is now in Hollywood working with Colonel Blake Owensmith, Co-ordinator of the Canadian Co-operation Project, in completing a second series of 13 radio recordings with another group of outstanding Hollywood personalities gladly participating in these programs.

By governmental action and official shortsightedness Canada could have imposed an iron curtain of bans and quotas. Instead, representatives of your government, in full co-operation with representatives of our industry, refused to curtail the transmission of ideas by way of the screen. Through our joint efforts a mutually satisfactory arrangement was worked out. The Canadian Co-operation Project is indeed a credit to men of imagination and goodwill who repudiated any iron curtain techniques.

Hollywood is the international centre of the world of sight and sound where talent and creative genius from everywhere are welcome. The literature and music of all the world is brought to the screen through technicians and artists from all over the world. In a real sense, therefore, Hollywood belongs to Canada and to Chile, to Austria and to Australia, to France and to Brazil as well as to the United States. Hollywood is as international as the oceans.

I hardly need to remind you Canadians here today that two of your stars have done outstanding screen portrayals of two of our greatest presidents. Your own Raymond Massey is the screen's foremost Abraham Lincoln. Your own Alexander Knox made Woodrow Wilson come alive again to millions of movie-goers too young to have known this great crusader for one world. Ingrid Bergman, born in Sweden, now portrays France's Maid of Lorraine in Wanger's epic film, JOAN OF ARC. Edward G. Robinson, an American born in Rumania, played the role of Dr. Ehrlich, a German Jew, when that film opened recently in Munich in the presence of the Lord Mayor and a distinguished company of Germans and Americans. Luise Rainer, Austrian born, brought to millions throughout the world a vivid picturization of the Chinese peasant mother in THE GOOD EARTH. Dr. Max Steiner, Viennese composer, wrote a four-hour musical score for GONE WITH THE WIND, in which a British girl played the Georgia heroine, Scarlett O'Hara. Greer Garson, the British MRS. MINIVER of the war years, becomes today the Polish-French Eve Curie, in a film which is among the most popular of all the pictures now being released in Central and Eastern Europe. Yes, Hollywood films have world casts and appear on world screens for a world audience.

Hollywood, however, is more than an international centre of the world of sight and sound. It is the centre of the art of story telling through the universal language of pictures. Therefore, we of motion pictures assert the rights of an art which uses simultaneously the multiple sensory appeals of words, music, motion, and color. This most popular of all the arts accepts fully its responsibilities to its world audience. Therefore, we oppose an iron curtain on ideas and refuse to accept dictation from any group which for any reason seeks to place Hollywood in an artistic straight-jacket.

Today Hollywood is making more adult pictures. Why? Statistics show that in the United States alone there are 10,000,000 more people today between the ages of 35 and 59 than there were 20 years ago. A similar situation exists in Canada where the life span of the individual, thanks to good health practices and scientific developments, is lengthening also. It is appropriate, therefore, that Hollywood should be making more adult films which deal with current issues in a realistic yet interesting fashion. Motion pictures need be no less entertaining because they have current significance.

I am speaking today on the eve of the Academy awards. The 3 films which are top contenders for this year's "Oscar" are illustrative of this trend toward adult entertainment—toward realism—and a portrayal of current issues. I refer to JOHNNY BELINDA, the deeply moving story of a deaf mute in your own Nova Scotia; THE SNAKE PIT, with the all-seeing camera eye moving about the wards of a hospital for the mentally diseased, and HAMLET, Britain's outstanding screen portrayal of Shakespeare's classic. These 3 films are symbolic of Hollywood's increasing determination to capture and hold a larger adult audience.

Let me hasten to add that if all pictures made in Hollywood were problem pictures, people would soon tire of them. Many of us face far too many problems already in business—in public life—and in connection with the philanthropic institutions to which we give large blocks of our time. There is unquestionably a therapeutic value in sheer escapism, so we refuse also the dictate of the cold-blooded intellectual or the chronic killjoy who would impose his own iron curtain on musical comedies, on slapstick and on fantasy. If we made only message pictures soon there would be no audiences in the theatres to get the messages.

Sir Alexander King, the newly elected President of the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association of Great Britain, spoke truly when, in his recent inaugural address, he declared: "You cannot legislate people into the theatres; you can only attract them." Diet, whether in food or films, must have variety if it is to continue attractive.

Hollywood is also a medium of information. As a purveyor of news and a producer of fact films in documentary form, the motion picture industry claims the same rights to freedom of expression as the press and the pulpit.

Last year, for example, our 5 newsreels carried 111 items about Canada in their various issues. These were of interest on both sides of the line and helped the peoples of our respective countries living as neighbours on this great North American continent to understand one another better and to appreciate each other more. We want no iron curtain to limit the freedom of our newsreels. By the same token we cheerfully accept the responsibility which is ours of doing an honest and workmanlike job in portraying the news of the world.

Finally, Hollywood is the centre of an industry—an industry built up through freedom for inventive genius—freedom for business initiative—freedom for artistic development. Hollywood is as much a boom town as Johannesburg, Tulsa, or your own Leduc. Instead of gold, diamonds, or oil, ours was a little gadget conveying the illusion of motion, upon which men of vision and courage staked their money and their time under a system of free enterprise. Hollywood is the product of private enterprise. The heads of our producing companies accept the thesis that the privilege of freedom carries with it the obligation to be just. We are unalterably opposed to an iron curtain of state ownership or state control.

In fulfillment of our responsibilities I must call your attention briefly to the codes of self regulation which leaders of our industry adopted in 1930 to provide standards for the moral content of motion pictures and criteria of good taste for their titles and advertising. These codes were adopted in order to make unnecessary the iron curtain of political censorship. Such censorship is arbitrary, wasteful and ineffective. What we do through industry self-discipline is an integral part of the process of production.

In 1948, for example, 435 feature length pictures and 511 one or two reel short subjects received our Association's Certificate of Approval, but 2,739 different pieces of material—novels, stage plays, film treatments and motion picture scenarios—cleared through our Production Code Administration. Fifty-eight books, plays and scripts were so far below the minimum standards of decency and good taste in our Code, that they were rejected and never resubmitted. Another 57 stories in the form in which they were offered originally violated basic principles of our Code, but were rewritten, revised and finally approved. Only 51 of the 535 feature pictures had to be changed at all after they were completed. This shows the degree to which the processes of our Code Administration are geared into the lengthy processes of production. This voluntary effort to maintain through self-discipline screen standards in harmony with the customs and practices of the rank and file of the people of our respective countries, depends for its enforcement on the moral support of just such groups as your club here. The degree to which you and the members of your families support the better pictures in the theatres of Toronto registers the measure of your backing in our continuing efforts to maintain and improve the standards of motion picture entertainment. We welcome your frank criticism when you believe that we have failed you; we invite your aggressive aid when a film comes to Toronto which is not only entertaining but informing and inspiring as well.

Probably you gentlemen in this room see more screen advertisements in the papers than actual films in the theatre, so you will be interested in knowing that last year there cleared through our Advertising Code Administration

93,810 still photographs, 18,083 advertisements, 490 press books and 521 trailers. It speaks very well for the advertising agencies and for the publicity departments of the film companies, that less than 2% of all this advertising and promotional material fell below the standards set forth in our Advertising Code. So I repeat: In asserting the rights of an art and demanding the freedom which properly belongs to a medium of communication, we have voluntarily accepted the obligation to make our pictures and their advertising conform to generally accepted standards of morality and good taste.

Let me turn now in closing, to our opportunities and obligations in areas outside of North America. All over the world, films from North America constitute the main source of screen entertainment.

Canadians who played such a determined and heroic role in two world wars need no detailed recital of the facts of the cold war now being waged between two diametrically opposed philosophies of life. Suffice it to say that in this struggle we of the American motion picture industry are determined that the pictures sent into the occupied and "Iron Curtain" countries of Europe and Asia, be of a type which will contribute to an understanding on the part of screen audiences everywhere of the free way of life to which we are dedicated.

A few weeks after the shooting ended in World War II we organized the Motion Picture Export Association, whose members comprise most of the leading Hollywood producers and distributors of films. Distribution rights to several thousand pictures never shown in the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia were turned over to the Export Association in order that from this huge stockpile its officers might select those films which would contribute most to an understanding of the West and aid most in reorientation and re-education of the peoples of Germany and Japan. Also we sift out films which North Americans would take in their stride but which would unquestionably give a distorted picture of life here to peoples of other lands.

Through the Export Association we have sent to 13 countries in Central and Eastern Europe and to Japan and Korea, such outstanding films as ABE LINCOLN IN ILLINOIS, WILSON, MADAME CURIE, WATCH ON THE RHINE, RANDOM HARVEST, HOW GREEN WAS MY VALLEY and KEYS OF THE KINGDOM. We are honestly trying to do a good job in selecting the best possible screen fare for these countries. SONG OF BERNADETTE when it opened in Vienna attracted such attention that Catholic organizations ran buses to and from the Russian Zone to bring thousands from that area to see the film. When this picture opened in Munich, Cardinal Faulhaber went on the radio urging people to see it, and gave an interview to the press. The public reaction was most impressive.

In Hamburg UNION PACIFIC played for 10 weeks. I saw Hamburg a few weeks after V-E Day and of all the bombed cities of Germany, that seemed to me the worst. This epic film which showed North American pioneers bridging a continent with links of steel and overcoming every conceivable obstacle in the process, furnished an example to the Germans of Hamburg of the way in which people of another country in another time surmounted obstacles and won through to victory. The task of the western powers in Germany today is to get such cities as Hamburg back into business where they can operate without subsidies from our taxpayers and assume a constructive role in rebuilding and re-orienting the Europe of tomorrow. We are trying to send in films which have undertones good for the Germans, good for the Japanese; films that show individuals and nations rising above adversity and winning victories of the spirit.

The dollars still flowing to Hollywood from Canadian theatres help to make possible this important service of motion pictures in the occupied and iron curtain countries. You have a stake in Hollywood. To you then belongs part of the credit for all the good that Hollywood films are doing in providing recreation, amusement, information and inspiration to the peoples of the rest of the world.

Mahatma Gandhi shortly before his assassination, declared:

> "I learned from my illiterate but wise mother that all rights to be deserved and preserved, rest upon duty done. Even the right to live accrues to those who perform their duty of citizenship to the world."

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen; The art that is Hollywood—the medium of free expression for which I am speaking today—the industry which I represent—is seeking to do its duty in behalf of the free way of life which has given to it the opportunity to develop as an industry, to flower as an art, and to serve as a vehicle of relaxation and inspiration to all men everywhere.

"CROSS-ROADS"

AN ADDRESS BY

PERCY JAMES PHILIP

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, March 31st, 1949

GENTLEMEN: As a matter of record I feel I should make some reference to a historical event in Canadian history which will take place tomorrow, when the oldest colony in the British Empire becomes the 10th Province of Canada.

This event adds a vast undeveloped territory to Canada which is virtually our front door, but what is more important brings into union with us a population which has always been outstandingly British in sentiment.

The Empire Club of Canada would like to place on record, through the medium of its Year Book and also by suitable salutations to Newfoundland's first Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Albert Walsh, the fact that we welcome Newfoundland most sincerely into Confederation with Canada and we are confident that that spirit of friendship which has always existed between us as neighbours, is a guarantee that the greatest harmony will prevail now that Newfoundland has become one of the Canadian family.

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

When considering what I should say in my introduction of our guest of honour today, I was forced to the conclusion that anything I might say must of necessity be more or less a repetition of many previous introductions, because this is the ninth occasion on which our guest speaker has addressed this Club. I, therefore, decided that brevity on my part would be appreciated by both our guest speaker and our members.

I think the fact that this is the ninth occasion that

Mr. Philip has addressed The Empire Club proves one thing—his previous addresses have always been so outstanding that our Speakers' Committee has never hesitated to invite him back.

For the benefit of those in our audience who have not heard Mr. Philip introduced before, I will tell you that he was born in Scotland, received his early education at George Watson College, Edinburgh, and later attended Oxford University. As correspondent for *The New York Times*, he spent 21 years in France, and since 1940 has represented that highly respected Journal in Ottawa.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Mr. Percy James Philip to members of The Empire Club for the ninth time, and on this occasion he has chosen as the title for his address "Cross-roads."

It was with some reluctance that I accepted to come again to address The Empire Club for the good reason that I did not know what to say, or how to say it. During the war years it was easy. All that you, or anyone, wanted to hear was an appeal to endurance and effort—a kind of tapping of drums.

After these grim heroic years—too easily forgotten—we could at least nurse the hope that, as matters could not be worse than they had been, they might be better. So, with caution, I spoke of the difficulties and the imponderable elements in the fashioning of a new world, but still on a note of restrained optimism. Then, the last time, somewhat disillusioned, I took as my theme the very actual situation of the world in which the British Empire had ceased to be the law enforcing agent it had been, and in which the responsibility for the preservation of order had fallen on others.

There I seemed to have come to the end of the road, or at least to a cross-road, where there were no sign posts and only vague undefined trails leading out into uncharted regions. I felt that it was none of my business, and beyond my capacity even to comment. The next move was up to those who had so vocally taken charge of the future from their vantage point of back-seat drivers.

At that cross-road, too, I found a multitude of excited people all giving different advice on which road to take. Most of them, it seemed to me, were urging that we take what seemed the downhill road of easy confidence, trusting all men, while a few were eager to drive ahead where there was no road at all. It looked as if we were drifting into conflict and chaos. I was so discouraged that when I received your flattering invitation to come back for this ninth successive year, I was tempted to decline and asked that at least my coming be postponed until events and my own ideas allowed me to see more clearly.

I understand that the gentleman who talked about television took my place—which seemed appropriate. He was, perhaps, better able to see round the corners and obstacles which obstructed my view. It certainly is astonishing that we should have invented ways of seeing at a distance through brick walls, people and things reflected on a little screen and yet have not even made the least advance since the days of the Roman Empire in the art of Government. I don't think much of what I have seen of human and political relations. During these past weeks things have happened which have helped me to see a little light ahead and helped spare you the gloomy and foreboding speech you might otherwise have had. I intend, however, to stick to my suggested title of Cross-roads, for it, I think, most adequately describes the point at which we stand at the end of the old road of Empire authority and at the moment of decision as to whether we shall take the Russian Communist road along which so much of Europe and Asia have already travelled, or the Atlantic road which we may call the seaway, the free way, the road of civilisation for civilisation, whatever you may think in Toronto has always risen to its greatest peaks among maritime peoples.

But before I begin to examine the chances of the Atlantic Pact doing the job the Empire and the British Navy did for so long in "promoting stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area" to quote the preamble to the Treaty which is to be signed next week, I would like with your permission to dissertate just a little on this matter of cross-roads. As a boy I toured nearly all of Scotland and a great deal of Ireland, North England, and many districts of France and Germany on foot and as I never had any definite objective beyond enjoying myself I used always to sit down when I came to a major cross-roads and examine where each might lead me and which promised the most interest, the best scenery and fair prospect of good accommodation at the end.

I took my time about it, because the essence of a walking tour is that one should never hurry. Sometimes of course I made mistakes but I learned one thing—that it was always wiser to keep along the crest of the hills than to take the easy road down into the valley. When I was tempted to take that easy road I always landed in some dull built up area and there was always a steep hill to climb on the other side.

Now the European walking tour is a very different business from your occasional habit of going hiking in the bush, usually with a gun or a fishing rod and some definite objective. I have had some very pleasant two and three-day walks along the trails in the Gatineau Valley, stopping the night at cottages and inns. But your distances, your roads and the utter desolation of large areas are discouraging to the walker and your inns, if I may speak frankly, are not what they might be, even with your improved liquor laws. The tourist camp is not a real substitute for the English village pub or the restaurants of France where the cooking is done only after the customer has arrived.

Our roads, too, wind about in such a pleasant unexpected manner, perhaps, as Chesterton suggested because:

> "Before the Roman came to Rye, or to the Severn strode,
> The rolling English drunkard made the rolling English road".

Yours go straight and the straighter they go the better you like them for they permit the motorist to rush along—

getting somewhere in a hurry and missing everything on the way, sometimes even the right turning. I think there is no duller road system anywhere in the world than the smooth, graded, landscaped parkways round New York, where everybody drives at fifty miles an hour, or more, and you cannot stop to admire the view, or take your breath, except at a regulation stopping place. There are more "no parking" and "no picnicking" signs along these parkways than there used to be "verboten" signs in Germany.

Now I do not wish to seem critical but I sometimes wonder if there is not more wisdom in the reflective walking tourist in Europe, who constantly changes his mind about where to go, than there is in the hurrying American, hell bent on getting some place called forward. We certainly kill fewer people and there is more to it than that. You have to correct your tendency towards speed by sticking up an enormous number of notices—like soft shoulders and sinuous curves—which are pleasantly suggestive. But you constantly disregard these signs and notices and dozens of times I have been carried miles out of my way by some confident of-course-he-knew-the-way-driver in a hurry who refused to stop, look and listen when he came to a cross-roads.

Perhaps I am stretching the analogy a bit far but, speaking as a European, I have found that this tendency to dash ahead with complete assurance and a momentarily inflexible idea, marks much of the political action on this continent, as well as its driving. It is, for instance, now admitted by many that it was a mistake to take some of the short cuts used to end the war as quickly as possible. Mr. Churchill's plan for the invasion of central Europe by the Danube Valley, as well as through Normandy, was rejected as likely to take too long. But it would have prevented a lot of subsequent headaches if we had reached Budapest, Vienna, Berlin, Prague and even Warsaw ahead of the Russians. One American friend of mine goes even further than I do in his attitude. He says we should have pushed right on to Moscow and dictated peace from there.

By dropping that A-bomb on Hiroshima we probably did shorten the war against Japan but we sowed dragon teeth which have kept us in a dither ever since. It would have been wiser to stop and think of that cross-roads in history.

Looking back, these rush decisions remind me of the story of the man who jumped out of a third floor window and broke his legs. When a sympathetic but inquisitive friend went to see him in hospital and asked "But why did you do it, John?" the injured man wearily answered "Oh I don't remember now, but it seemed a good thing to do at the time."

I am afraid that that is the only justification some of our political and military leaders can offer for some of their decisions.

We hurried into the United Nations organisation without, I fear, a great deal of critical reflection or attention to road signs. There was a lot of high-pressure salesmanship. To anyone who had lived through the experience of the League of Nations as I did from the first meeting in Paris, in January, 1920, to the last in Geneva, in December, 1939, this new effort at a world parliament and a world Government without a police force, was a hopeless undertaking from the start. It was based on the absurd premise that all peoples are as capable of democratic self-government as the Anglo-Saxons who have been striving after it since Magna Charta was signed at Runnymede and not even now with complete success.

I think it was reading the dreary debates of the annual U.N. Assembly in Paris last Fall that produced that feeling of acute depression, which made me reluctant to come here and make a report to you. I just cannot regard all that almost hysterical business of setting up a kind of sentimental state in Palestine as a great accomplishment and, with the spectacle of independent Burma before us, I cannot approve the meddlesome interference of U.N. commissioners in the affairs of the Dutch in Indonesia. The Dutch were always good administrators—they are an adult people—under whom Indonesia prospered, while these alleged Republicans were Japanese puppets at a time when we were all fighting desperately for our lives.

Just about that time when the U.N. was showing itself so trifling and inadequate in face of the giant problems of the rule of law in expansion of Communist influence in Asia, and of the chaotic state of central Europe, I happened to attend a dinner given in Ottawa by the Canadian Government to a distinguished visitor—Mr. James Forrestal, then United States Secretary for Defence. It was there curiously that I felt the first little gleam of hope that perhaps despite all the argument and confusion of ideas and advice, we might get back on to the right road. Mr. Forrestal is a quiet man and quietly in the middle of an unreported speech he dropped this remark: "Most of our troubles arise of course from the fact that the British Empire is no longer doing the job it did. Many people thought that that would be a good thing, that the British had been on top too long. But some of us now realize, far more than we ever did before, how important that job was and how well it was done. We have not yet found anyone to do it or any organisation to put in the Empire's place."

When I heard that statement from an American I could not resist letting forth a lonely little cheer from my place at the foot of the table. It atoned for so much superior criticism that I had had to endure. But it seemed to give some of the Canadian Ministers and dignatories present just a bit of a jolt. They were obviously surprised and slightly embarrassed. Perhaps it had not occurred to them that the peace and security of the North Atlantic area, and many other areas, was not just a natural phenomenon. They had never admitted that perhaps they owed the security to British statesmen and the British Navy.

For the first time in these recent months this Continent has become aware that wishful thinking, being smart, and dependence on someone else, are not enough to assure its safety, that it had better do something about restoring the Pax Britannica of the 19th century by creating a new authority.

It is at that cross-roads that we stand today. What the British cannot any longer do alone, and what the United Nations has so obviously failed to do the nations of Western Europe and North America will next week agree to try to do. If I may again quote the preamble to the Treaty which is to be signed in Washington: "They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security."

It is along that road that Canada has agreed to travel, in good company. It is to that course that you are committed. It is for you and the United States to prove that you have got what it takes to do this task.

Now I have seen too many solemn treaties made and broken, or allowed to fall into discard, to welcome the signature of even the best of them with unqualified enthusiasm. What matters, I have found, is the public spirit, the character of the people behind the signature and the moral courage of all the signatories to live up to the spirit and the letter. I most sincerely hope and pray that this Treaty will not be a dead document but a living force. And to that prayer should be added at once another that that force will be used authoritatively for the preservation of peace, wisely and prudently and not rashly in a manner which will lead to war.

We have been told, and to a certain extent it is true, that this treaty is not like the treaties and alliances made between nations in time past for their mutual support, because it is not directed against any power or group of powers. We are told, too, and again to a certain extent it is true, that this strong association of free peoples will by its very existence assure peace because it will make any would-be aggressor think twice and perhaps more than twice about the risk he would run in provoking war.

These are good arguments for public consumption. But, I submit, they could be bad arguments if they were to lead to any acceptance of any complete sense of security, and forgetfulness of the need for constant vigilance. It is true that this treaty is not directed against Soviet Russia, but let us be realists. It is directed against the expansion of Russian imperialism in the name of Communism. It is directed against a system of government which denies individual and national liberty, which is not founded on the principles of democracy and does not respect any law but its own. If we are to defend our own liberties we cannot altogether remain on the defensive, satisfied with our own small world. Ours must be an active and not a static defence of our principles. We must talk high with the power and the will to enforce the law. Those who have taken the succession of the Empire must have the moral strength to govern without having to use their force.

And do not let us lull ourselves into indifference and inactivity by believing that the men in Moscow will be afraid of us. They are not that breed of men. I am sure that they will, just as I hope we will, try to avoid war for anyone who has had experience of war in his own country is not going to be so foolish as to risk it again twice in his own lifetime. The Russians are too well aware that among their satellites there are much stronger fifth columns, of anti-Communists than any Communist fifth columns we may have among us. But these men in Moscow are fanatics—who believe in their system and are already drunk with a sense of their own power. They have a brave, enduring people. In a cold war, which is what we must expect, they will be patient, obstinate and skilful. We must be prepared to fight this cold war with perhaps even more patience, obstinacy and skill, of which we have not shown a great deal, never neglecting the essential basis of our unity and our collective force, to which every member country must contribute its fair and full share.

Our aim is peace, but among nations, just as in the home, the school and the community, you cannot have peace without authority and good direction. People work best when they are governed—lightly if possible, but governed. At present, and we better face it, we have lost or nearly lost the authority and leadership we had. Except for our old friend Malcolm Maçdonald fighting his little war in Malaya, the Dutch struggling to maintain law in Indonesia, and Nehru facing a wave of communistic revolt in India, all Asia is looking towards Moscow and not London and Washington for direction. They do not know how harsh the government of Moscow can be. Our Western Christian democratic civilization has lost prestige while we have been fiddling about with idealogies, and putting our trust in atom bombs and not in law and the spirit.

Our hope today is that we are setting out on the right road at last. But it is going to be an uphill road and we better get rid at once of a lot of that heavy impediment we have been carrying of sentimental ideas about how things should be and face the reality of things as they are. You cannot have peace and security without moral fortitude as well as military strength. And you need also common sense.

The great new feature of the pact is, of course, that it goes as far as can possibly be managed or expected now to assure that if the western nations of Europe are again attacked from the east—whether it be Germany or Russia or Asia—in which democracy has never been a living thing, the United States will be under obligation to take some part from the beginning. We hope we shall not have to wait another two or three agonising years until some incident or their fears compel them to take part. I do not think that we shall hear any more about cash and carry or too proud to fight. The isolationists have lost their long battle—although I noticed that Mr. Bevan was greeted with tomatoes and there was a small feminine group at the dock to meet Mr. Churchill when he arrived in New York, screaming that they did not want to be dragged into war. It was the last flutter of protest, as he recalled with a chuckle, to the storm which his Fulton speech aroused only three years ago. When the United States moves, it moves massively, for the instinct of the people is sound, however, at times, it may be misdirected.

There is only one more thing I want to say as we start out along this new road. It has been the habit on this Continent in these past years to think and say that you have been dragged into wars by Europe. That conception of things permitted you to enjoy a smug feeling of moral superiority. It has been only since the real scare of the last war, and since the threat of Communist Imperialism with all the weapons of modern war began to trouble your sleep that you have, even in Canada, realised that in fighting the Kaiser and Hitler you were fighting your own war for the maintenance of the security of the North Atlantic area.

But now I feel the tables may be turned. In this new alignment of the forces of Western Europe and North America for the defence of liberty and the rule of law it may just happen that it will be the countries of Western Europe which will be most reluctant to begin to fight. In the first place they have had enough war—more than enough. They know that a nation and a civilization may be destroyed by the cost of victory just as completely as by defeat. They will fight the cold war against Communism with better heart because the pact gives them the assurance that America will stand by them but they will not easily be pressured into war.

And there is another thing. The English philosopher, William Stapeldon who told that curious world peace conference in New York last week that the British people would never be as wholeheartedly against Russia as they were against Germany. That I think is true, and it is true also of the French, and of others. They may dislike the Communist system and method just as strongly as any on this side of the Atlantic but they will do their utmost to check its spread and defeat it without fighting another of these wars which bring only desolation and heartbreak. In that reluctance of the Europeans to fight, there seems to me a fair guarantee that we will not be induced to drive too far and too fast this new automobile we have built, along the road we have chosen to travel together.

Gentlemen, I am glad that I have been able to speak to you in a happier mood than I was in when I received your invitation. We have chosen the up-hill road. It may be hard for a time for there are steep grades and nasty corners to be negotiated, but I think we can be sure that we are on the right road. Now we must hold to it undiscouraged if we want to preserve liberty and law, truth, honour and happiness in this world of people.

"THE BATTLE FOR EUROPE'S MIND"

An Address By

MAJOR VINCENT W. PRICE, K.C.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, April 7th, 1949

Honoured Guests and Gentlemen:

We have heard much from this platform regarding the war devastation in Europe, we have heard and read much regarding the progress that is being made in the reconstruction of those devastated areas, but comparatively little has been said on the vitally important problem of what progress is being made in the restoration of a saner outlook on the part of large masses of the European population who have been saturated for the past two decades with Nazi, Fascist and Communist doctrines. This is a far more difficult problem than the replacement of physical assets and on its solution the peace and future welfare of Europe unquestionably depends.

Today our guest speaker, Major Vincent Price, has chosen as the subject of his address "The Battle for Europe's Mind" a subject on which, I venture to say, no Canadian is more qualified to speak, because Major Price has been Chairman of the Canadian Council for Restoration since 1947. This Council is the Canadian Section of UNESCO the important United Nations' Agency which is concerned, among other activities, with educational, scientific and cultural reconstruction in the devastated areas of Europe.

Major Price is a graduate in Arts from McMaster University, studied law at Inns of Court in London, England, graduated from Osgoode Hall and has practised law in Toronto since 1920.

He served in the First World War with the Royal

Grenadiers of Toronto and was mentioned in despatches on two occasions.

He was also President of the Ontario Branch of the English Speaking Union for 10 years and among his many other activities, has found time to contribute numerous articles on international affairs.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce the sixth member of The Empire Club of Canada to address us this season, in the person of Major Vincent Price, K.C.

1. THE UNIVERSAL THEATRE

I suppose, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, that of all the well-known lines which have come down to us through the centuries, from the mind of William Shakespeare, no words are more familiar than these, from the play, "As You Like It":

"All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players;"

I would link with those words, the less-known lines which come immediately before them, and they are these:

"This wide and universal theatre
Presents more woeful pageants than the scene
Wherein we play in."

Today, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of being with my fellow-members of this Club. I would invite you to accompany me to Shakespeare's "Universal Theatre", and to look out upon the broad stage of the world, where scene after scene passes before us.

II. THREE SCENES ON THE WORLD-STAGE

At the moment, I see this world-wide stage set with *three scenes,* each separate and distinct, yet all on the same world-stage.

On one side is the Canadian scene: Here the stage is well set; all the properties needed for dramatic action are there—science, industry and nature have provided these—allowing a bountiful choice. There is an atmosphere which only the things of the spirit—a free spirit—can produce; education, the humanities and freedom of religious faith have contributed their subtle influence. Then, there are the actors, the men, women and children of Canada, and for these actors, by comparison, life is abundant, life is free and life is relatively secure.

On the other side of this great world-stage, there is another very different scene. It is the *Soviet Russian* picture. Here a dark curtain hangs in the front of the stage; no action is visible; no characters can be seen, and at present we can only conjecture on what is actually going on behind that dark curtain.

We shall return to that scene later, but now, I would ask you to look at the centre of the world-stage, for there is the *European scene.* The curtain is up: there are only scattered and damaged properties; the actors, tired, but hard working, at times seem thwarted in their performance. But the first thing which draws our attention is the Back-drop, for *there,* on the Back-drop of the stage, is a vivid picture,—drawn in vital strokes—depicting the material destruction and human suffering brought about by the war.

There, we see *Norway* and *Denmark*! The agony of five years of Nazi occupation; stripped of their assets; schools destroyed and some 700 Norwegian teachers put in slave labour camps and tortured because they refused to Nazify the schools—martyrs in the cause of freedom!

There, we see *Holland*! More than 20% of her land destroyed by enemy flooding. Famine, in the winter of 1944-45, when people died at the rate of 1,000 per week. Schools wrecked, and more than 70,000 Dutch children with no means of education until the work of reconstruction got underway.

There, too, on the Back-drop, we see *France!* The Normandie Invasion coast, and elsewhere, show terrific suffering. The Nazi-occupation has affected the entire pageant; Universities and schools demolished; world-famous works of Art lost and great Cathedrals in ruins!

Then, there is *Belgium,* Land of Learning, and the traditional "cock-pit of Europe"; high-lighted by vast areas of appalling damage. As I look on that scene, I cannot forget the remark of a high Belgian official. "We have the custom of being destroyed, but we have the energy to start again!"—"The custom of being destroyed" —What are the results this time? 2,500 of Belgium's bridges demolished, many of them on two occasions. One-half of all the elementary school destroyed. Once again, the historic Universities of Liege and Louvain seriously damaged. The Library at Liege having lost more than 50,000 books. Louvain, with ancient manuscripts and many rare volumes gone forever. We see Public Libraries, like those of Ostend and Tournai completely destroyed: the Public Library of Tournai, alone, with 72,000 volumes lost. Those are only *some* of the pictures in the Backdrop of the stage. Add to them the stark revelation of:

Italy, with its widespread damage to schools, universities, and means of communication.

The appalling conditions still continuing in *Greece.*

The colossal destruction in *Poland,* yes, and in *Russia* too.

The plunder and devastation by the Nazis, in *Jugoslavia.*

And their suppression of *Czechoslovakia.*

And then, the inestimable destruction in *Germany* itself.

The entire picture is part of the balance-sheet of World War II, which left as a legacy, a multitude of orphan and suffering children, and a wrecked and shaken humanity. How true are Shakespeare's words that

"This—universal theatre
Presents more woeful pageants than the scene
Wherein we play in."

III. THE DEVASTATION OF THE MIND.

Tragically, there is another very important aspect to the European scene, and that is the *Devastation of the Mind.*

The destruction, and forced closing of schools and institutions of higher learning, the wanton burning and looting of libraries, the wrecking of families and home life, the wholesale liquidation of teachers, professors, scientists and religious leaders, which took place in the Nazi-occupied lands,--all these combined to tear down and destroy the things of the Mind and the Spirit. For, let us remember this important fact: In time of War, as wars are now conducted, it is the intellectual life, the *mind of the nation,* which is the very *first* to suffer, and it is the *last* to recover when the fighting is over.

IV. THREE GIGANTIC PROBLEMS.

And so it is that, since the end of the War, Europe, in the face of that Back-drop, has had to cope with three gigantic problems:

First: A Material Problem: Rebuilding and re-equipping thousands upon thousands of educational institutions.

Second: A Human Problem: Rebuilding the lives of millions of children and young people who have been without normal education and home life.

Third: A Mental and *Spiritual Problem:* Restoring intellectual life and thought among the people of those lands, building up self-confidence, and renewing faith in themselves and in the fundamental things of life, in the concept of freedom and the value of the individual personality.

V. THE BATTLE FOR THE MIND.

But now, today, just when this process of recovery was getting underway, the European scene has become the main battle-ground of a new War. This time it is a *War of Ideas!* For, there is taking place on the world-stage, a gigantic struggle for the *minds* of people everywhere. Primarily, it is a battle for the mind of the people of Europe.

This is not a political or economic battle.

There are two great opposing forces: On the one side, the idea, the almost fanatical religion of world-wide Communism, as taught and practised by the Soviet Republics, and as controlled and directed by the Soviet-dominated

Cominform. On the other side are being mustered all those vast and intangible forces which embody the conception of freedom, in its broadest and deepest sense: the freedom of man, his mind and his soul.

Just about a year ago, by a sudden move from behind the dark curtain, there came the tragic fall of Czechoslovakia. It made a most profound impression upon the people of Western Europe. It increased their feeling of insecurity. It also destroyed the fund of good-will which Russia had built up by her stupendous efforts and sacrifices during the War. In Czechoslovakia, as in all Soviet-dominated countries, there followed coercion and suppression in the realms of art, of science, of thought and of religion. I venture to suggest that the future will show that the greatest mistake which the Soviet leaders have made has been their relentless attack upon the freedom of the mind and the spirit. It may well prove the eventual undoing of the Communist ideological aggression. For, above all else, the people of Europe want to maintain their own way of life, and their intellectual and cultural freedom. As Mr. Churchill said last week "You can never quench freedom".

VI. THE FORCES OF FREEDOM.

In this great struggle for the freedom of the mind and spirit, let us consider for a few moments, what are some of the forces mustered on the side of freedom.

Today, I would mention only *three*:

A. *UNESCO.*

First, there is one agency of the United Nations, which may, and should be able, (I underline those words), to play a most significant role. That agency is UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, with Headquarters in Paris. Forty-six nations, including Canada, are members of UNESCO. Thus, it cannot represent any particular political or economic system. Essentially, it is a *Peoples' Organization.* Its main purpose is to help the cause of Peace by taking a stand and working *against* certain things, and by taking a stand and working *for* other things.

UNESCO is working *against* Ignorance, Prejudice, Intolerance and Coercion in all its forms and wherever found.

UNESCO is working *for* Knowledge, Understanding, Tolerance, Human Sympathy and the Freedom of Man.

It is dedicated to the task of breaking down national barriers, so that the people of all lands may see each other, study each other and understand each other, so that, eventually, they may co-operate with each other.

Unfortunately, and I think, significantly, the Soviet Union has never joined the UNESCO organization. Nor have some of its satellites. It is equally significant that three countries—Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary,—at present dominated by the Soviet,—*are* members of UNESCO. That, in the long run, may mean a great deal. It is encouraging and important to note, Gentlemen, that everything UNESCO stands for, is the very antithesis of the restraints, the coercions, the bondage and all the evils of the Soviet Totalitarian System. For, in that System, as we know full well, there is no freedom of the mind and spirit, no freedom of expression in the realms of science, art and literature, no freedom in economic and social life and no freedom in religious faith.

The major problem on the world-stage today is the threat to freedom, and all that is wrapped up in the term "Iron Curtain". The *Challenge* of UNESCO is to bring together *People* and *Ideas!*

Of all the agencies of the United Nations, UNESCO is the one most likely to penetrate the Iron Curtain. "Ideas have Wings"! No curtain has ever been made, which can keep out Ideas, no matter how vigorous a censorship is maintained behind it. A few of the people come out from behind, and return again. The radio waves are hard to imprison, and in those lands there are heroic souls struggling to keep alive the sparks of freedom. Nothing can prevent the basic ideas of UNESCO from infiltrating the countries of Eastern Europe.

B. *CANADA.*

The *Second* force for Freedom, which I would mention, today, is our own Nation. What part is Canada taking in this colossal task of the rebuilding of the Mind? Canada, through th Canadian Council for Reconstruction through UNESCO, is spending about One Million Dollars, given by the Canadian people, including the children of our schools, to carry out a great five-fold project:

First: 20,000 Boxes of School Supplies have been sent to the elementary classrooms of the damaged schools in *eleven* European countries. In addition, food and clothing have been sent for the teachers and pupils.

Second: Financial assistance is being given to *nineteen* selected Universities in France, Italy, Greece, Belgium, The Netherlands, Norway and Austria. This will help them to replace much needed scientific equipment, which was destroyed during the War. In addition to these, *ninety-three* European Universities are each being given ten subscriptions, for three years each, to the leading Scientific, Literary and Art Journals of Canada.

Third: Sixty-four Fellowships are being awarded to 64 persons, holding positions of responsibility in their own lands. They are from some fourteen countries, and have been most carefully selected. They will return to their own lands after a period of study, and after seeing and sharing in our way of life. It is important that we should make them welcome.

Fourth: Practical aid is being given to the creative artists, the painters, sculptors, writers, musicians, architects and workers in the crafts in the countries of Western Europe. This aid will help to supply them with the materials and tools of their crafts, and also much needed food and clothing.

Fifth: The recent "March of Books" Campaign, throughout Canada, will carry thousands of selected books from the people and the libraries of Canada, to the people and the libraries of Europe, to help in filling the great gaps of which I have spoken.

This *five-fold programme* has been planned on the belief that education and the restoring of the intellectual life are among the strongest weapons in developing and preserving freedom in all lands.

C. *THE FREEDOM PACT.*

The *Third* potential force for Freedom is the North Atlantic Security Treaty, signed in Washington on Monday last. It has been rightly called the "Freedom Pact".

That Pact is *realistic;* it is *necessary.* It is a pact for Defence and Security; it is *not* for Aggression. In my judgment, it will strengthen and *not* weaken the United Nations, for it will attempt to *assure Security* in at least a large part of the world, where Security does not now exist.

But it would be folly of the highest order, to treat the Pact solely as a military alliance. We must not think of this Pact as a sort of "Maginot Line", armed and fortified, behind which we can sit in complacency. The mentality of the "Maginot Line" means apathy, indifference and a false sense of security.

There is much more in the North Atlantic Treaty than a military alliance for defence. It calls specifically for the strengthening of our free institutions, and for bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which those free institutions are founded. We cannot rely on weapons alone. The atomic bomb will not save our western civilization and all the things we cherish. There must be much more than a policy of containment of Russia. There must be a fuller justification of our free way of life. And, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is not out of place to suggest that there must be, too, a spiritual rededication which should end the preaching of hate and race-prejudice, wherever that occurs, and should bring about more fully the practice of tolerance, human sympathy and respect for the dignity of the ordinary man.

Thus it is, that the underlying ideas of the North Atlantic Pact can be crystallized in these words: *Strength, Firmness, Patience* and a *Dynamic Programme* in the cause of *Freedom.* While we are thinking in terms of our own security, vital as that is, let us not forget that the only effective way to meet the spread of the Communist ideas in the war-torn lands, is to provide the people of those lands with a means, and a way of life that is *better*, so that they may be free to *live*, free to *learn*, free to *think* and free to *act*.

VII. *THE CHALLENGE*

In this battle for the mind, the greatest responsibility rests upon those who have faith and are free to express it. That imposes a special obligation upon the peoples of the British Commonwealth, and the great English-speaking World. For, among all our peoples, we enjoy as a gift and a heritage, the essential freedoms which are now in danger.

Gentlemen, in this great struggle for the minds of men I am confident that the British Commonwealth will continue to stand, as it has stood firmly in the past, a strong bulwark for peace and freedom.

Canada, now expanded with her ten provinces, her ever-widening horizon and her increasing responsibilities, must be a solidly cemented corner-stone in the Peace structure, confident, prepared and unafraid.

The task and the challenge in this grave hour are embodied in simple words which came to me from that little island across the sea, Britain, which, down through the long centuries, has done so much in the cause of justice and liberty. The lines are these:

> "And we who have inherited the Trust
> Must also pay the price that it demands,
> And share the burden faithfully, as they
> Who gave their all, to place it in our hands.
> Thus shall we prosper, thus undaunted, free,
> Shall we fulfil our spendid destiny."

"CANADA FINDS HER VOICE"

AN ADDRESS BY

ARTHUR STRINGER

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, April 14th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

To day we welcome as our guest of honour a famous author in the person of Mr. Arthur Stringer, a native-born Canadian who first saw the light of day in Chatham, Ontario.

Mr. Stringer now lives at Mountain Lakes, New Jersey, and when I read *that* I could not help wondering why he left this fair Canada of ours. I found the answer to this question when I glanced through Mr. Stringer's address to this Club on April 7th, 1932, when *he* said in his opening remarks, I quote, "and having been in this fair city of Toronto for a couple of days brings home to me what was really troubling Robert Barr when he complained that Canadians were willing to spend more money on their whiskey than they did on their authors." We do hope, sir, you now find this condition much improved.

Mr. Stringer attended Toronto University and later went to Oxford. His literary ability was established at an early age, his first book "Watchers of Twilight" was published when he was only 20 and he seems to have written one or more books nearly every year since that time.

Mr. Stringer has travelled very extensively. He has visited South America, Africa, Europe and spent considerable time in what we might describe as the hinterland of the North American Continent, including Labrador, Alaska and the Hudson Bay Country of the North. I have no doubt that much background material for his many writings originated from these travels.

In 1940 he accurately predicted the discovery of atomic energy and its initial use in an atomic bomb in his book "The Ghost Plane." This prophecy resulted from his intimate knowledge of pitchblende found at Great Bear Lake.

I now have pleasure in introducing a man who while legally an American citizen, has shown through his persistent choice of Canadian subject matter for his many novels that spiritually he still belongs to Canada. Mr. Arthur Stringer, who has chosen as the subject for his address

"CANADA FINDS HER VOICE"

Mr. Stringer:—

At the annual dinner of the Poetry Society of America a few weeks ago I sat next to a mysterious lady who didn't seem much attracted by either me or the menu. She merely toyed with her fruit cocktail and disdained her terrapin soup and scarcely touched her chicken a-la-king. When she pushed away her peach melba I not unnaturally asked her if she was on a diet. "Diet my eye!" she answered. "I'm on the speakers' list!"

I can only too well appreciate that lady's mental perturbation. I know just how she felt. For as the slave of the ink-pot and the typewriter I share with Thackeray an embarrassing forgetfulness when facing an audience. It was Thackeray, you may recall, who said it was only on the way home in a cab that he remembered all the bright things he had intended to say. So, to make sure I won't get lost in unfamiliar territory, I've a road-map here in the form of a script. For I have to watch my step in this city. As a member of those melancholy expatriates who have been dubbed the League of Fallen Maple-Leaves I have learned to tread lightly when I venture back to the land of my birth. The need for that came home to me at a Convention of the Canadian Authors' Association here when a large wholesome-looking stranger shook hands with me with unexpected warmth and said this was a red-letter day in his life. He explained that he liked everything I'd ever written, that he had a scrap-book full of my little things, and that I ought to be the Poet Laureate of Canada. "Why, my wife over there," he protested, "would walk ten miles to get her hands on one of your poems." And while I was trying not to feel like a flapjack being inundated with maple-syrup he turned and called across the room: "Dearie, come over and shake hands with Wilson Macdonald!"

You know, I'm at last beginning to understand why the beaver is our national emblem. I thought, once, it was due to the industriousness of what had been designated as merely an amplified rat. But I was wrong there. For outside its industry the beaver has one peculiar and distinguishing trait. That peculiarity stems from the conviction that its home isn't habitable until it has been well dammed. And recent events in this fair land of ours persuade me the Canadian isn't happy in his home until he sees it well damned. It seems to be done mostly by our authors, authors who ought to be the mouthpiece of a magnificent young country but turn out to be merely exponents of its misery.

For only a couple of months ago, I find, Robertson Davies described Canada as a dull, dry desert and Canadians as dull and stodgy people. He hissed through his whiskers that they were spiritually constipated and the only Serutan that could save them, apparently, would be a cathartic infusion of the Fine Arts. They were so crass and insensitive in their daily activities, he contended, and life in the Dominion was so desperately dull that is was speeding up our rate of insanity, filling our asylums, and driving our young geniuses abroad. And the only way to keep the country from turning into a demi-continental Snake Pit, the only way to keep everybody from going nuts, would be to paint more pictures and act in more Little Theatres and lilt more lyrics. We must wipe out that deadly conservatism of ours, and get more abandoned. And regeneration may come, apparently, when we all get busy dancing in the streets.

Then not so long ago Hugh McLennan—and this hurts because Hugh is accepted as an astute interpreter of Canadian life—told us how dull we Canadians are. We were not only living in a reign of dullness but in art and literature we were doing mighty little that interested the outside world. And due to that dullness, he claimed, thousands of young Canadians were becoming so fed up with the emotional caution of their elders that they were leaving Canada in droves. He was, of course, only repeating what he had said earlier in the American Saturday Review of Literature, where he contended Canada had no literature of its own and that if we all perished tomorrow our neolithic tribe would be of less interest to future historians than are the people who lived in the ancient Graeco-Egyptian colonies of the Upper Nile. Why, he sorrowfully asks, has the gift of tongues passed Canadians by?

Then there's Chancellor Gilmour of McMaster who only two or three months ago took pains to point out how Canada had failed to produce so many of the finer things of life, how as yet she had no distinctive Canadian culture and no independent intellectual identity, and how she faced the double-barreled peril of losing distinctiveness through emigration to other countries and the nefarious influences brought in from the United States.

But that's not all. Last month you had Merrill Denison here telling you how apathetic Canada was towards fine arts and how you overlooked your authors and ought to make yourselves into a reception committee for emerging masterpieces. Then a few days later Will Bird proclaimed in Ottawa that Canadians were afraid to be themselves. He accused them of deferring pathetically to foreign opinion and showing a preference for magazines and books not made in Canada. We were turning, he claimed, into a nation of copy cats. And just about the same time James O'Connor intimated in the Victoria "Colonist" that the trouble with our native book-market would end when the Canadian author woke up and wrote books worth buying.

It's a sad state of affairs. And the therapeutic value of verdicts like that is about as energizing as having your doctor put away his stethoscope and telling you you'd be a dead man before the end of the week. It's a sad state of affairs. I can't understand, as I glance around me, how you all look so happy. It leaves me wondering why you don't all emulate the lemmings of Norway and swarm down to the Bay and jump in. It leaves me puzzled that so poor a place as Canada could produce an Osler and a Banting and a Graham Bell and a Vincent Massey, could give birth to a Roberts and a Carman and a Lampman, and a half a hundred others who are today giving voice to our national aspirations and making us known both to ourselves and the outer world. And it's about time our home-made Jeremiahs lost a little of their gloom and gave up their job of selling Canada short.

We Canadians, of course, have had to get used to being told we don't amount to much. The late lamented Kaiser, when he concocted his cultural map of the world, marked Canada off as a blank. Sara Bernhardt, when last in this country on one of her repetitious farewells, complained that we had no poets and no poetry. Robert Barr said we spent more money on our booze than on our books. When a group from the Canadian Authors' Association journeyed to England and visited George Bernard Shaw that Chesterfieldian Irishman announced that he was under the impression Canada *had* no authors. Much of Shaw's eminence, of course, has been achieved through his rudeness and his tendency to stand Truth on her head. For when this same Association of authors invited him to Canada his gracious response was that he had no intention of visiting an outlandish country of savages where a man of Shavian alertness would promptly die of intellectual starvation. That shrinking violet (who got his first recognition on this side of the Atlantic), could today be told that Canada has so many dramatic groups performing his plays and such frantic drama festivals that the village butchers talk about audience reaction and our city plumbers are hankering to play Hamlet. He might also be told that two Canadian books last year dominated the best-seller list in the United States, and that during the last decade Canadian books have equalled American books in merit, if not in numbers.

And right here I'd like to interpolate a word or two about Canadian poetry, our native poetry as you will find it, for example, in that precious but often impoverished quarterly known as the Canadian Poetry Magazine. I've been comparing that Quarterly with the Poetry Magazine of Chicago, with its millionaire backers and its claim that it incorporates the best the States can produce. Perhaps it does. But if our Canadian poetry isn't better than what's coming out of Chicago today *I'll eat my hat.* The sad fact that our Canadian Poetry Magazine keeps alive only by the skin of its teeth makes me wish every man in this room would take time off to get acquainted with that Quarterly (it's only two dollars a year) and help the world to understand there are new voices in this new country of ours that are worth listening to. But to revert to our elders, it's not easy for a country old in time and tears to discern the spirit that makes this new world of ours what it is. Outsiders don't always understand us. Even Rupert Brooke, when he crossed Canada from sea to sea, was ready to proclaim it was a godless place where the maple and the birch conceal no dryads. This Dominion, he protested, had no background and no ghosts, whereas the soil of England was heavy with the decaying stuff of past generations.

That last charge I'd like to answer with a brief poem, a poem written by a native of this denuded country that never had any poets. It is called "A Westerner in England" and voices the New World preference for foresight rather than hind-sight, for the forward and not the backward look:

They showed us their ivied towers,
  Their walls so grey with time,
Their tombs of kings whose bones turn dust
  Where the moss and lichen climb.

They showed us their stately halls
  And their gardens soft with rain
Where the regal roses seemed to make
  Their scarred land glad again.

But under their roses lay
  The graves that backward led,
And under the gardens bright with bloom
  Slept deep their storied dead.

Yet I longed for my New World home
  Where few dead warriors rest
And youth rides free in the foothill dawn
  Where the glad trails greet the west.

And the care-free heart outspans
  Where the camp-fires star the slopes,
And time and tears and the troubled past
  Seem lost in tomorrow's hopes.

In other words, we're still a young country. Heaven knows, we've had that said to us often enough. We're still at the awkward age, they tell us, and too much mustn't be expected of raw youth, especially of delinquent youth that plays hookey from the Sunday-School of civilization. But if we're so young and so bad it strikes me as a mighty poor way to fight this juvenile delinquency, with all this monotonous harping on our sins and the nagging haven't been and ought to be.

It's time for a change. And the change is taking place. It has, in fact, already taken place, only here at home we're too deep in the forest of that alteration to see the trees of accomplishment. We are no longer a blank on the map of culture. We have found our voice. Just how much we have done so was brought home to me when I heard a war-worn New York editor size up Canada's new literary activity by claiming that today you can't go trout-fishing in Ontario without snagging an author and you can't throw a snowball in Montreal without hitting a poet. It explains why those Yankee editors and publishers now send talent scouts into this Dominion of ink-slingers to round up authors of promise before they're tied up with Toronto publishing-houses. Half a century ago those authors had to migrate or go hungry, standing as they did between the devil of impecuniosity and the deep sea of emigration. But the tide has turned. The Canadian writer no longer needs to join that League of Fallen Maple Leaves whose members had to struggle along by what the circus people call "Riding Roman", with one foot planted on the Canadian beaver and his other foot on the American eagle. He can give up that sort of straddling. For today he finds himself face to face with a literary renascence, or, rather, a literary flowering, in many ways as stirring and as vital as Ireland knew half a century ago with its Celtic Revival. His country has emerged from that pioneer state in which Earl Grey said it was too busy with the plow and the axe to give much time to the pen. We may not yet have a national flag, and we may still be in need of a national anthem that can be sung without hesitating gloom. But those things will come. For we have acquired a national spirit, and a knowledge of our northland vigor, and a pride in the strength of our Dominion that stretches from sea to sea. Our country has a wide beauty all its own. It has natural grandeurs that give creative impulse to the author, just as the author in turn must give those grandeurs new richness by making them recognizable. He is beginning to learn how deep the grass-roots go, how much the homeland background colors and helps to create what he craves to express. Election time in Quebec, it is true, may make him suspect that he inherits a house divided as he comprehends how a perfidious Albion of the seventeenth century didn't happen to lose out on the Plains of Abraham. And the occasional cousinly clashes of the provinces may persuade him Dr. Johnson wasn't so far wrong when he said that patriotism, in politics, is the last resort of a rogue. But in literature it stands the first inspiration of the writer. And we, who were born and cubbed in the North, know that strength comes out of hardihood, that our north-born fruit has a tang all its own, that our Northern Number-One Hard is the best wheat in the world, and that there's something vitalizing in a province that can make possible the MacIntosh Apple and something superior and inspiring in a country that can produce a Barbara Ann Scott.

This nationalism I speak of has its undoubted values. But it also has its perils, just as mere regionalism can have its pitfalls. It's fine to wake up to the appeal of our folk-life. But it might be fatal to over-stress the peculiar and local and in doing so neglect the universal and fundamental. It's fit and proper to encourage the native author. But when the village poet orates his latest masterpiece it's wise not to throw perspective to the winds and cry out with clannish pride "Whar's your Wully Shakespeare noo?" For art is a flower that can't be forced. Its roots are too involved with those deeper values that make up the soul of the artist. And the first duty of an author, if he is to rate as an artist, is to know that own soul of his, and then know the soul of his country, and finally make it known to the far-flung world.

The way we are to be known to the world must not depend on either those academic stuffed shirts who rate our poets as Custer rated Indians—it was Custer, you will remember, who said the only good Indian was a dead Indian—or those mine promoters who so eloquently enlarge on the possibilities of our Pre-Cambrian Shield. Nor should it stem entirely from those tourist folders that expatiate on the outdoor bake-ovens of Quebec and rhapsodize over the plentitude of wild-life awaiting the visitor's rifle. Our culture goes a little deeper than game preserves and fish hatcheries. It may pay, in this mechanized age, to be arrestingly picturesque. But to accentuate the medievalisms in our midst is as deluding as trying to keep our Royal Mounted an army of lyrical "Rose-Maries".

Nor does the hope of the future repose in big talk about our scenery merely as scenery. The St. Lawrence is a noble river, and our Rockies are unmatched in grandeur. But big rivers and big mountains don't mean much until they have been linked up with the dreams and destinies of man, and made memorable in recorded history and the loving words that spell true literature.

Perhaps I'm wrong about those loving words. For our novelists, I find, are becoming more analytical and more realistic in their portrayal of Canadian life. They are venturing to paint even the low life of a slum parish, even daring to interpret existence on the ragged fringes of our big cities, and doing so without reverence and without warping sentimentality. We are slowly but surely groping our way into the field of the drama, the drama that was once the product and special possession of Broadway. Our poets, from Ned Pratt down, are singing happily and hopefully. But we seem still to be without the unifying note, the compelling endemic song that warms the blood and knits our scattered provinces into one cohesive dominion. We are a little afraid of the homely. We have as yet no ballads to stir the heart, no "Swanee River", "My Old Kentucky Home", no "Carry Me Back to Ol' Virginny".

Perhaps a Canadian Stephen Foster will come along and fill the gap. Before he does, we must remember that by heritage we are inclined to be a reserved and unostentatious people, still suspicious of too much sentiment too openly expressed, and not yet entirely out of the shadow of a Calvinistic puritanism that put austerity before art. Besides being a dispersed people we are two races living under one roof and still nursing the delusive claim that bilingualism can be a benefit to this country or any other country.

Perhaps in time we'll learn to be more vocal about our pride in Canada. We could learn something from the Californians who, I found during my exilic year in their state, never miss a chance to glorify their particular corner of the globe. At a funeral there the parson said; "Our brother has gone to a better world—if there is a better world than California." And that attitude is confirmed by the experience of another Californian who passed away and presented himself to St. Peter. When St. Peter asked him where he was from the newcomer said from California. Whereupon St. Peter shook his head and said: "Well, come on up, but I don't think you'll like it here."

And now that I'm too old to set bad examples I can at least give some good advice. That advice would be to tell you to be more aggressively Canadian, to be more passionately proud of our great nation, and not to overlook those men who are translating its greatness into literature. For this country's future depends on what the world thinks of it, and your author is its interpreter and its ambassador of intelligence. Let him do his creative work in the country to which his heart-strings are tied, knowing that if there is fidelity in his picturing of life, however localized, that portrayal will ring true to the outside world. Give him bread enough to keep him alive, and give him attention enough to keep him alert. For without him to put it into lasting words, all your work and all your wealth doesn't amount to much. And that truth was never better expressed than in the Ninth Ode of the Fourth Book of Horace as paraphrased by Pope:

In vain their Chief's, their Sage's pride;
  They had no poet, and they died.
In vain they schemed, in vain they bled;
  They had no poet, *and are dead.*

"INTERNATIONAL AVIATION—AN EMPIRE TIE"

AN ADDRESS BY

GORDON McGREGOR

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, April 21st, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

While developments in aviation have introduced a new menace to our security, they have also made it possible for the British Commonwealth to mobilize its defences in any threatened area at a speed which is almost fantastic.

Oceans no longer represent weeks of travel, they are spanned in a matter of hours. Canada and the Mother Country are now only a few hours apart and the same applies throughout the whole British Commonwealth.

Our guest speaker today, Mr. Gordon R. McGregor, President of Trans-Canada Air Lines, has chosen as his subject "International Aviation, an Empire Tie."

I am sure no one is more qualified to speak on this subject.

Mr. McGregor's interest in aviation dates back to 1932 when he joined the Kingston Flying Club. Three years later he won the Webster Trophy, which is awarded to stimulate improvement in amateur flying. He won it again in 1936 and 1938.

A year before the Second World War broke out he joined an Auxiliary Squadron of the R.C.A.F. and in 1939 left his position as District Manager of the Bell Telephone Company at Montreal, to go on Active Service.

Flight-Lieutenant McGregor was one of the historic "few" who staved off defeat during the crucial Battle of Britain and ran up a score of five Nazi aircraft destroyed and shared credit for downing a sixth. His record also included seven probables and eight damaged.

Mr. McGregor won rapid promotion and after commanding the Second Canadian Fighter Squadron, became Wing Commander, taking part in sweeps over France and later becoming Director of Air Staff, R.C.A.F.

At the time of Dutch Harbor he was posted to Alaska as Commanding Officer of the Canadian Wing, serving for a year at Anchorage and in the Aleutians.

Mr. McGregor joined Trans-Canada Air Lines in 1945 and is the first combat flier of World War 2 to become President of an airline.

I now have very much pleasure in introducing Mr. Gordon R. McGregor, O.B.E., D.F.C.,—Mr. McGregor.

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN:

It is a frightening thing to see so many people in this audience who have had the doubtful pleasure of listening to me on this subject of aviation time and time again. I think that is particularly true of Mr. Jackman, who has asked me many embarrassing questions on T.C.A.—he is a member of the Parliamentary Committee which deals with our financial statements.

I am very grateful to your Committee and you for giving me this opportunity of talking to you on a subject which I think is of vital interest to nearly all of us here who are in the aviation business or its close brother, the Air Force, or even simply as Canadians interested in the affairs of our country.

International aviation in Canada, as in most other countries, is really a subdivision of the broader subject of civil aviation, and before getting down to international aviation as such, and the bonds of the Commonwealth Nations, I would like to generalize for a moment on the broader subject. Even those of us who spend most of our waking hours in direct contact with aviation matters find it exceedingly difficult to keep abreast of the rapidity and scope of the development that went on during the war, and even in a more pronounced manner since. The prophecy of today is the accomplished fact of tomorrow, and even at the moment one is making a prophecy one is apt to find that somewhere else in the world the prophecy was accomplished a day or so ago.

Two examples of this occurred to me within the last ten months. I heard one who might be regarded as an expert prophesy that "Some day aircraft would pass through the sonic barrier", and a few days later I heard the comment made that "Some day both coal and grain would be transported by air". The fact is that at least two nationalities have been through the sonic barrier, and some two million people are being fed, clothed and kept warm by means of aviation, though naturally not on an economic basis—in Berlin. There seems to be a great readiness on the part of the people responsible for that Berlin Airlift to have it go on indefinitely.

To digress for a moment, the Berlin Airlift is an excellent thing for civil aviation. Lessons are being learned not about civil aviation as such but about the very great problem of what we call "Air Traffic Control". We have all heard comments about the various problems of stacking up at fields like LaGuardia. The aircraft in Berlin are timed-in and arrive at something like 50 second intervals, and there is no stacking, an amazing record of reliability with that immense density of traffic, using an airport which was not built for that volume.

I would like to speak to you for a moment too about Trans-Canada Air Lines, not because I happen to have anything to do with it, but because I think it is a good example of the speed of development which I spoke about. I happen to have direct access to the figures involved in T.C.A., and I think that T.C.A. is unique in the rapidity of its growth.

As you all know, Canada at one time held the world record for air-freight moved. Those were the days when the North was being very rapidly developed by the bush pilot. But it was surprising that in spite of the fact that it is a natural ground for development of air transportation, with its centres of population broadly spread and without a widely developed highway system over its long distances, that Canada was a little bit slow in getting started in air passenger service. In 1937 T.C.A. started operating a passenger service over a very short run between Vancouver and Seattle, but it was not until 1939 that the Company really got in the business of carrying passengers. And, while in that year, 1939, it carried 21,569 passengers, in 1948—the year just completed—it carried 532,555. Now that type of growth is verging on the explosive, and it is not accomplished without a good deal of trial and tribulation.

Another figure that may be of interest, although I will not quote too many, is the revenue passenger mileage (that is simply one passenger being carried for a mile, multiplied by the number of passengers and the mileage). That increased in those nine years—1939 to 1948—from 12,068,661 to 249, 575,644.

The increase in frequency and size of aircraft again emphasizes that point. Three years ago T.C.A. was operating daily two 14-passenger Lockheed Aircraft between here and Vancouver, giving a total daily capacity of 28. Today we are flying two North Star aircraft of 40-passenger capacity, and at the end of this month those two will be joined by a third. In other words, the capacity has moved up from 28 three years ago, to 120 next month, and I am inclined to think that that third transcontinental will still be in service next winter.

Now I mentioned the North Star, and in view of various things that have happened, it may be well to give you a few figures about it.

As I mentioned, it is a 40-passenger plane.

The maximum speed	350 m.p.h.
Still air range	3,800 miles
Weight empty	48,000 lbs.
Gross weight	80,200 lbs.
Length	93 ft. 5 ins. long
Wing span	117 ft. 6 ins.

Fuel capacity	3,226 gals.
Maximum horse power per engine	1,725.
Fuel consumption	250 gals. per hr. at maximum cruise.

Now I don't propose to touch too strongly on a controversial subject, but I do want to say that it is an exceedingly good airplane, and we are entirely happy with it. If given the choice of direct trade today, I don't know of any one we would be inclined to make. An airplane is a most complex collection of gadgets, and it has never happened that a new airplane—and in spite of references to its antecedents the North Star is a new aircraft—has been assembled without going through a multiplication of what you would call "the bugs" in a new automobile, and I don't think a new automobile has ever been produced that it has not been necessary to iron out a few quirks. Exactly the same is true of the North Star except that there has never been the slightest indication or any need to ground the airplane as has been the case with its three post-war companions, the Constellation, DC-6 and the Tudor. Both the first two I mentioned have met that unhappy fate, and the worst happened to the Tudor.

So there need be no apologies for the North Star, and it will give many years of valuable service as it is doing today.

I think that at this point it would be well to talk about Civil Aviation from the standpoint of its various functions, apart from the very mundane business of moving people from place to place. It holds a very definite place in the military scheme of things and I like to think of civil aviation, and all that goes with it—by that the airports, what we call the airways, facilities for navigation, the electronic aids, fuel supplies, aircraft and engines, and all the ancillary equipment—and most necessary of all, the trained personnel—as something in the order of a Fire Department. I speak of that in the military application and in terms of transport aircraft as opposed to combat types. A Fire Department is necessary to maintain protection against the unhoped for event of the fire, but unless there are fires the trained crews just stand by. In the case of civil aviation you have the Fire Department, but you also have something that you keep usefully employed and which at least comes close to paying its way. During the last war, transport aviation was found to be an absolute necessity through almost every branch of military activity, and it is impossible to think of a nation at war without a strong transport group.

That can be accomplished by a combination of two ways: A fire department comprising a strong branch of military aviation for peacetime use, which would be very definitely limited. Or by building up a very strong civilian aviation strength which would be useful in peacetime and which could be quickly turned over to the military adaptation.

Now to branch a little further into the business of what I originally started to talk about—International Aviation. The figures I quoted to you earlier had largely to do with the domestic operation. The international aviation picture, of which I will give you again a few figures in a moment, has been expanding, if not at a greater at least at an equal rate to domestic transportation. This applies particularly to Canadian companies, and I think the part that international aviation plays in the life of a country can not be stressed too greatly.

I stressed a few minutes ago referring again to the Fire Department, the position of civil aviation in the natural defence of a country, but more than that aviation links have a tremendous effect on the development of trade and the cementing of relationships between countries, not only of the Commonwealth, but countries in general. Drawing from experience, I would like to tell you it is a most interesting thing to sit in at meetings of what is known as the International Air Transport Association and listen to the delegates, all of whom are members of airlines of various nationalities,—the countries represented have been as high as 52, and people speaking more than 10 different tongues, citing exactly the same problems, the same solutions to those problems, the same views of development, the same ideas of regulations which should apply, and hear agreement on so many subjects from so many peoples, whose governments are at odds with each other at the same time.

I think a very intriguing mental gymnastic these days, after looking back to those developments I spoke of, is to try and cast into the future. It is a thankless operation, and you are sure to be wrong, but some things can be said with a modicum of accuracy. It would be obviously wrong to try any mathematical projection, having in mind the last three years of development, only to arrive at astronomical figures as to the number of people who will be travelling around the world in the next ten years. But we can try the trick such as played by Mr. Kipling in a story of his some 35 years ago called "The Night Mail", in which he described a flight which he had from the United Kingdom to Quebec. It was supposed to take place in the year 2,000, and while he was wrong in regard to the type of air vehicle, it being a lighter-than-air rigid dirigible both powered and kept aloft by an imaginary gas, and while he was also a little bit wrong in the time required to produce the miracle, it is nevertheless the case that the speed of that trip as forecast, all his description of air traffic controls, were almost identical as they are today—1950.

It is an amazing thing that long before the first trans-Atlantic flight, the man should be able to do that type of casting into the future.

While I am on the subject of casting into the future, and on the basis of more recent developments, I would like to say there are a few things that can fairly well be determined. The development of aviation today seems to be somewhat threatened by this question of congestion around airports that I referred to before. That congestion applies not only to each individual airport, but congestion around the cities as well. The approach patterns of an airport have to be much larger in diameter than the actual perimeter of the airport. It is obvious in cities like Toronto and New York, where as the communities grow encroachment on the approach patterns by high buildings is inevitable.

For that reason I think it seems necessary to assume that the problem of getting fast aircraft on and off the ground will undergo tremendous changes probably within the next fifteen or twenty years. It seems not too imaginative to say that we will have an aircraft that will be able to attain very high speeds at very high altitudes, and to descend or ascend nearly vertically, or very nearly so, and not make violent contact with the ground in the process. That is, as I say, casting well into the future.

We do see such developments as TURBO-PROPELLER-DRIVEN COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT, which represents the same relationship as the turbine liner does today.

We see INSTRUMENT LANDING systems in existence, and being developed to a point where we have completely blind landing systems just around the corner. And we see these IMPROVED SYSTEMS of AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL such as that which is in operation in the Berlin area. These are with us today. And it is certain that either TURBO-JET or FULL JET TRANSPORTATION will be in in a very short length of time.

Again I come back to this difficulty of crystal-gazing. I think it was about 1880, when Mr. Cunard waved goodbye to the first steamer across the Atlantic, which also had a mast and sails in case of eventualities, and I wonder if he had any conception of the *Queen Elizabeth*. Mr. Cunard had 400 years of sailing experience behind him at that time, and we only have about 40 in reference to aviation.

I was surprised to find the other day the date on which Alcock and Brown—who, by the way, were the first people to fly the Atlantic, whether that is sufficiently well known or not: I think there are countries not far away where you could ask that question and get a different answer. They made their epic flight on June 14, 1919, which conveniently subtracts itself from '49—thirty years ago. Thirty years ago two people flew across the Atlantic. They dropped their undercarriage at the take-off in Newfoundland, and achieved a planned crash landing in a bog in Ireland, 15 hours and 57 minutes later.

The summer schedule for the ten airlines now flying the Atlantic, calls for 126 round trip crossings per week, an average of 18 per day. None of those aircraft will be equipped with less than 40 passenger seats, which means 720 seats both ways crossing the Atlantic every day.

Now to get back to yet another subject—what I originally started to talk about, and that is what does all this mean so far as the British Commonwealth of Nations is concerned? I think the answer is, it means a great deal. Britain's Merchant Marine has been the life line of the Empire in peace and war. I think you will agree that international aviation is beginning to play a very similar important part in maintaining contact between England and her Allies and the Commonwealth Nations. This would be particularly true in war time. There is no reason as I see it, why in the fullness of time, international aviation of an Empire nature should not take some part very similar to that played by Britain's Merchant Marine in the past, and I think it will have to be if the Empire is to survive. I sincerely hope that the Commonwealth Nations will not leave that problem and expense entirely in the hands of the Mother Country. It would be wrong, and there is no evidence of it. Canada, and Australia to a lesser extent, are devoting time and money to the development of all British routes and this could easily prove to be in the future the salvation of the Empire

MR. HARRY R. JACKMAN, M.P., thanked the Guest Speaker.

"ANNUAL MEETING"

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, April 28th, 1949

GENTLEMEN: This meeting of The Empire Club is our Annual Meeting and in accordance with established custom in previous years, I shall just present a brief summary covering the year's activities.

The complete financial statement will appear in the Year Book, and I am happy to be able to report that it will show an estimated surplus on the year's operations, of about $500.00. This is attributable to the fact that we have been able to effect a number of economies in the conduct of the Club's affairs and to the generous response of the membership to the letter I sent out last Fall, drawing attention to the large increase in the cost of producing our Year Book. The receipts from this appeal amounted to $745.25, and I would like to place on record the sincere thanks of your outgoing Executive for the generous response you gave to my appeal.

I regret that I am not able to give you as good a report regarding our membership. We started the year with a total membership of 1,420; during the year we secured 78 new members, against which we had 73 resignations—39 were dropped for non-payment of dues and 26 members passed away during the year, all of which adds up to a net loss in membership of 60, and our total membership now stands at 1,360.

During the past season we have held 28 regular meetings and there was one special meeting in May, 1948. We have been fortunate in securing a very high calibre of speakers throughout the year, which I think would compare favourably with previous years, and while our average attendance was just about the same as last year, it was a disappointment to your Executive. I feel I would be shirking my responsibilities if I did not say something on the subject, even though this is the last occasion that I shall appear before you as your President.

I think The Empire Club might be likened to a Church —you have a nice edifice, a good choir and the minister can preach an excellent sermon, but if he has a poor congregation you can hardly say that his ministry is a success. The same applies to The Empire Club. Your President may conduct his meetings satisfactorily and the guest speaker can be outstanding, but I think you will agree our success is measured by the numbers attending our meetings. I see before me many members who are very loyal and regular in attendance; *you* are the backbone of this Club and I know we can rely on that same loyalty in the future. I feel certain the incoming Executive will want to do something on this suject of attendance and whatever that may be, I am sure *you* will give them your wholehearted support.

While your President holds the spotlight from week to week, the smooth running of the Club is largely due to the efforts of the other members of the Executive who give of their time and talents largely behind the scenes. While time will not permit mention of them all, I would like to pay tribute to the splendid work done by the Chairman of the Speakers' Committee, Mr. T. A. Pugsley, who unfortunately is now living in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Then I would like to say a special word of thanks to our Honorary Secretary, Col. Bennett, who has at all times been most helpful and co-operative. Mr. Horace Harpham, Chairman of the Head Table Committee, has done his usual splendid job and been of great help to me on many occasions. To the Chairman of the other Committees, and all other members of the Executive go my personal thanks and I am deeply appreciative of the excellent attendance we had at all our Executive meetings.

There is just one other person I would like to mention, who has never failed us throughout the past year. Like your President, he appears before you from week to week—I refer to Mr. Harry C. Bourlier, who so capably presides at the piano, to him I am sure we all say thank you.

I will now call on Mr. R. A. Stapells, Chairman of this year's Nominating Committee, to read the report of that Committee.

MR. R. A. STAPELLS: Gentlemen: The following is the recommendation of the Nominating Committee for the year 1949-'50:—

Officers:

President—Mr. H. G. Colebrook.
1st Vice-President—Mr. Sydney Hermant.
2nd Vice-President—Mr. Warren B. Hastings.
3rd Vice-President—Mr. R. Ford Ralph.
Hon. Secretary—Col. John Hyde Bennett, V.D.
Hon. Treasurer—Mr. W. W. Comber, C.A.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. H. T. Jamieson, C.A.

Executive Committee:

Colonel F. F. Arnoldi, D.S.O.
Mr. Harry C. Bourlier.
Brigadier Colin A. Campbell, D.S.O., O.B.E.
Mr. S. S. Fletcher.
Mr. Frank T. Gerow.
Mr. John W. Griffin.
Mr. D. H. Gibson.
Mr. Horace Harpham.
Mr. George Hardy.
Mr. Norman A. Keys, K.C.
Mr. James H. Joyce.
Mr. G. A. Lascelles.
Mr. J. Morgan.
Sq./L. Norman A. Nunn.
Mr. J. P. Pratt, K.C.

Mr. John Wm. Perry.
Commander R. H. Stokes-Rees, R.N.

Immediate Past President:
Mr. Thos. H. Howse.

Past Presidents:
Mr. Tracey E. Lloyd.
Major Frank Clouse.
Major James W. Baxter, M.C.

I move the adoption of this report. Major Fife: I second the motion.

Mr. T. H. Howse: Gentlemen: You have heard the report of the Nominating Committee, which has been duly moved and seconded by Mr. R. A. Stapells and Major Fife. Are there any further nominations? There being no further nominations—I declare the nominations closed and those whose names you have heard read, to be duly elected by acclamation.

I am sorry that I cannot have the pleasure of introducing our President-elect, Mr. H. G. Colebrook. Unfortunately, he is out of town, but I have a message from him which I would like to read:

160 Yonge Street,
TORONTO 1, Canada,
23rd April, 1949.

Dear Mr. President:

I regret that my absence from the City on the 28th instant will make it impossible for me to attend the Annual Meeting at which time I understand I was to be installed as President of the Club for 1949/50.

Will you please convey to the Executive and all members, my appreciation of the honour conferred upon me and my assurance that my best efforts will be put into the carrying on of the Club in keeping with past tradition.

With kind regards.

Yours very truly,
"H. G. Colebrook".

Mr. Thos. H. Howse,
President, Empire Club,
c/o Maclean-Hunter Publishing Co.,
University Avenue,
TORONTO, Ontario.

I am sure the Nominating Committee are to be congratulated on the excellent Executive they have chosen for the coming year. I know our President-elect, Mr. H. G. Colebrook, to be a gentleman of high calibre and ability, and I am sure the destinies of the dear old Empire Club will be in good and capable hands during his term of office.

The Nominating Committee made one change this year. In previous years it has been the practice to appoint the immediate past President and three other past Presidents who are taken in rotation. This year it was decided to appoint the three immediate past Presidents and one from the list in rotation. It is thought this method will retain the active interest of those who have more recently presided over the Club affairs for a longer period and prove more helpful to the President in office.

"CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE FUTURE"

An Address By

MAJOR-GENERAL C. CHURCHILL MANN,
C.B.E., D.S.O.

Chairman: The President, Mr. Thos. H. Howse

Thursday, April 28th, 1949

HONOURED GUESTS AND GENTLEMEN:

I feel that I should first apologize to our guest speaker for encroaching somewhat on his time with the formalities of our Annual Meeting; if you need to take a few extra minutes I am sure you are forgiven.

Our guest of honour today is Major-General C. Churchill Mann, C.B.E., D.S.O., former Vice-Chief of the General Staff at National Defense Headquarters, Ottawa, and he has requested that his address be regarded as strictly off the record.

When war broke out he was attending the Staff College at Camberley, England. Recalled to Canada, he was appointed General Staff Officer, in charge of Intelligence for the 1st Canadian Division and proceeded overseas with General A. G. L. McNaughton, in December, 1939.

General Mann took a prominent part in the Dieppe raid and much of the knowledge secured at that time was based on his reports.

He was appointed Chief of Staff of the 1st Canadian Army in January, 1944, and held that position throughout the Normandy invasion, the battles of France, Belgium, Holland and Germany and until the Army's dissolution.

It now affords me very great pleasure to introduce Major-General C. Churchill Mann, who has chosen as the title for his address "Conclusions as to the Future"—

General Mann:—

Introductory: My object is to present the principal factors which will influence the course of events for the next decade in our relations with Russia, and to draw the conclusions clearly, concisely, and unmistakeably.

Our Two Fundamental Choices: Different social and political systems have, for centuries, existed side by side. Wars do not necessarily result unless there is a basic clash of vital interests. However, I believe that a calm, sober comparison of the paramount objectives of the U.S.S.R. with those of the Western Democracies can lead only to the conclusion that, at some stage, we are bound to have to face up to armed conflict, unless either—we surrender our way of life completely, and come under Soviet domination, or the Politburo comes under the influence of those members whom it is rumoured support the idea of rapprochement between capitalist Democracy and the Russian dictatorship in the belief that these two systems can co-exist.

The Paramount objectives of the Two Opposing Ideologies: Let me summarize the paramount objectives of the two opposing ideologies.

The U.S.S.R.: The continuation of Communist control in Russia, the extension of Communist control leading eventually to world domination, and the security of Russian territory.

The Western Democracies: The continuation of our way of life, national sovereignty, the security of our respective territories, and international co-operation within the United Nations Organization.

The Vital Question: The vital question is this: Are there really any practicable measures which, if taken, would enable us to achieve our objectives, prevent the Russians achieving theirs, and still not involve us in war?

Conditions Governing the Answer: In my opinion, if we are to avoid war, and still achieve our paramount objectives, one or more of the following conditions must be fulfilled:—

(A) There must be a real, evident and accepted change in the long term objectives, basic policies and methods of operation of the present Soviet Government.

(B) The Russian people must overthrow the present Soviet Government—with or without outside Assistance.

(C) Success must be achieved in evolving international control, with adequate safeguards, in the field of atomic energy and other weapons of mass destruction.

(D) There must be a substantial change in the balance of power in Europe.

(E) The Western Democracies must establish definite perceptible military strength in relation to the U.S.S.R.

Now I am going to deal with each of these briefly. I believe you will find yourself in agreement with my conclusions.

The Prospects of a Real, Evident and Accepted change in the Long Term Objectives, Basic Policies and Methods of Operation of the Present Soviet Government: Many idealists believe there is an opportunity to convert the Russians to the principles of Western Democracy. They believe that if we press our programme of education, propaganda and cultural relations, we will make real progress. They feel that by demonstrating the capabilities of Democracy the Russians will decide to establish a more moderate form of government. However, we must remember that the Soviets have had thirty years to establish and consolidate their position, and this during periods of great internal violence, economic revolution and invasion.

Undoubtedly the Western Democracies should continue their efforts in the faint hope that some success may be achieved before the crisis, but the hope of success is all too slim.

The Russian People Must Overthrow the Present Soviet Government With or Without Outside Assistance:

The great mass of Russian people are controlled by a very small minority. Some people offer the hope that the Russians will eventually realize the inadequacy of their form of government to provide them with the freedom and standards of living which obtain in the Democratic countries, and that the people of Russia will rise and overthrow their Government. Some suggest that on the death of Stalin, there will be a struggle for power which will present the opportunity to dislodge the Communist Party. In appraising such possibilities the strength of the Totalitarian Regime with complete control of the press, radio, police and military power must be taken into account. No substitute party exists in Russia today which would be capable of taking over the reins of government quickly. The "Iron Curtain" is sufficiently tight to preclude significant assistance from the outside.

Success Must be Achieved in Evolving International Control, With Adequate Safeguards, In the Field of Atomic Energy and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction: This means evolving a practical formula for the abolition of war itself. The discussions in the United Nations make it apparent that there exists an irreconcilable difference between the Soviet authorities and the Democracies.

The acceptance by the Soviet Government of the Atomic Energy Commission's proposals seems to be a very long way off at present; despite the fact that no people would benefit more from the peaceful application of atomic energy than the Russians themselves: and therefore perhaps a way will finally be found to overcome the Russian opposition—which at present is adamant.

The Prospects of a Substantial Change in the Balance of Power in Europe With a Revival of Military Strength Beyond the Present Limit of Russian Control: In the past year substantial progress has been made. We have the Benelux Agreement, the Brussels Pact, the Arrangements of Western Union, in embryo the Council of Europe,, and now the Atlantic Pact.

If these developments continue, and our peoples give more than lip-service to the undertakings involved, a really great stride will have been made. However, it is difficult to see how we can reach a position, within a few years, which would make it possible to withstand a determined Soviet offensive in Europe.

We must realize that morale and self-confidence, renewed physical stamina and well-being are not easily restored in countries which have been over-run twice in our life-time, and which have been on short rations now for about ten years.

Nevertheless, with the assurance of prompt and substantial military aid from the Western Hemisphere, an organized Europe resisting with determination would provide a cushion of time and distance of great importance which would make the establishment of Russian control over Western Europe more difficult.

We may conclude that all efforts to strengthen Western Europe should be pressed with a sense of urgency.

The Western Democracies Must Establish and Maintain a Definite and Perceptible Military Strength in Relation to the U.S.S.R.: It is unlikely that the U.S.S.R. will start a major war as long as the Western Democracies can inflict decisive damage upon the Russian homeland. Now, while military strength of itself cannot prevent war, it can serve to postpone its outbreak. It follows that the Western Democracies should maintain military establishments of the type, quality and quantity which will make it evident that aggressive military action by the Soviets will precipitate prompt, severe and ultimately decisive action by the forces of Democracy.

It is of equal importance for our own peoples to realize tha practical measures of real significance are bound to require some sacrifices from everyone. Adequate military establishments capable of acting quickly and effectively as a cohesive force cannot be made effective unless there are both the equipment and the personnel in the necessary quantities, and these in a state of training which will give pause to the Kremlin.

Conclusions: My conclusions are as follows:

(A) That there is little prospect of altering the objectives, basic policies and methods of the present Russian Government.

(B) That the chances of the Soviet Government being overthrown by the Russian people in the next few years are slim.

(C) That there does not appear to be any likelihood of establishing effective international control of atomic energy in collaboration with the U.S.S.R.

(D) That the prospects of a substantial actual revival of Western European political, economic and military power in the next few years are only moderately encouraging, although progress is being made.

(E) The establishment and maintenance of definite and perceptible military strength by the Western Democracies in relation to the U.S.S.R. is of paramount importance, but depends for its effectiveness on the realization by our people of the necessity of so doing as long as the threat to our security remains.

Summing up these conclusions leads me to the conviction that the present conflict between the Western Democracies and the U.S.S.R. whether arising from mutually intolerable political philosophies alone, or from the Soviet concept of the ultimate organization of the world, or from a combination of both, will eventually and inevitably lead to armed conflict—unless we are prepared to be submerged as satellite countries under the dread rule of the Kremlin.

I shall therefore continue on the proposition that war with Russia is inevitable, and that sooner or later we shall enter World War III with the Russians as our implacable enemy.

On this proposition, the next problems are: When must we expect World War III to take place? In what circumstances will it occur? And what course should be followed, in the problem of ensuring the continuation of our way of life?

When Must We Expect World War III to Take Place? Although it is possible, it is unlikely that World War III will commence for a few years. No major power desires war at present, all will go to reasonable limits to avoid it. Both sides prefer to exhaust all methods short of war to achieve their objective and ambitions. It is unlikely that Russia, on her initiative, will permit war to develop until she calculates that the chances for success are in her favour. At present, the Western Democracies still have relative advantage due to our superiority in technical, scientific and industrial power, in the control of oil resources, in our superiority in sea-power, long range air-power and the sole possession by the United States of the atomic bomb in quantity. Finally, the terrific devastation in the Russian homeland resulting from the German occupation must be taken into account.

The 1947 report by the U.S. Air Policy Commission suggested 1952 as the earliest date for a planned war on Russian initiative. My only comment is that this is now 1949. Certain it is that the attitude displayed by the Western Democracies in the next few years is of great importance. If we adopt a firm posture I believe we shall go far towards giving cause to the Kremlin in this matter.

My answer to the question—"When must we expect World War III to take place" resolves itself as follows: Probably not before 1952, and thereafter the date will depend to a large extent on the firmness of public opinion in the Western Democracies in giving support to actual measures calculated to deter the U.S.S.R. from war.

What Will be the Circumstances of World War III?: We must consider the probable developments of World War III under two sets of conditions. (A) During the period, if such occurs, not involving the use of atomic, chemical or biological weapons. (B) Under the circumstances where both sides take advantage of all weapons at their disposal.

The Situation Which Would Probably Arise if the Use of Atomic, Chemical or Biological Weapons were not involved: It seems that the Russians would not find it difficult to over-run Europe and major strategic areas elsewhere. One immediate effect would probably be that Great Britain would be forced into an immediate fight for her own survival. The difficulties of organizing effective retaliatory action without the facilities of the United Kingdom would certainly add greatly to our problems.

In any event, a vigorous air offensive would be a prerequisite to other operations. In order to force Soviet submission our offensive would require air forces of tremendous size. The air offensive would have to be brought within effective operating range of the vital areas of Eurasia. This would involve ground forces in many cases, but I believe that the general strategic employment of ground forces would be considerably different than in World War II. However, such matters can best be left to those who are still concerned with strategic responsibilities. The weight of attack and the logistic support (supply maintenance and security) would have to surpass by far similar efforts in World War II because the target objectives would be greater in number and more effectively dispersed.

Despite the problems which would result in the Post World War III period, it might be necessary to destroy again much of the industrial and transportation complexes of all Europe and Asia in order to accomplish the successful conclusion of the strategic air offensive because these facilities would be worked for the benefit of the Russians if over-run by them.

The enemy defensive efforts would probably be greater than those of World War II, thus increasing our loss ratios and, with the increased capabilities of modern submarines and the added difficulties of anti-submarine warfare, the enemy might impose material requirements for the control of the essential lines of communication which would be most difficult, if not impossible, for us to meet.

Due to the petroleum requirements for our air offensive and the war at sea, plus the needs of the ground forces, it is quite possible that we could maintain our air offensive at a decisive level by the use of conventional weapons alone.

In such circumstances it is evident that a situation of stalemate could develope in which both sides lacked offensive capabilities; Canada and the United States might be approaching material exhaustion; Great Britain might be neutralized and the U.S.S.R. would probably be in possession of all Europe and Asia.

The Situation Where Both Sides Plan to Take Advantage of any Weapons at Their Disposal. Including those Capable of Mass Destruction: We must concede that the Russians will succeed, in the course of time, in solving the problems of atomic bomb production.

Now as we all know, nations at war may defer the use of weapons whose employment would adversely affect world opinion, but they will be likely, when pressed, to use all weapons at their disposal which offer real military advantage to them, after taking into account the reprisal aspects if such weapons are also in the possession of their enemies.

It seems doubtful therefore if either opponent would hesitate eventually to use any weapon at their disposal to attain victory or prevent defeat in the ultimate struggle for survival. A war waged with both sides in possession of atomic bombs in quantity would be catastrophic.

I believe that if the conditions I have just stated do occur, that any restrictions as to weapons will be withdrawn either in an effort to achieve victory or to avert defeat or exhaustion, and that we will then move into a state of total war, with no holds barred. If this situation develops we can, in my opinion, contemplate the collapse of civilization without having achieved the solution to our problem—namely the removal of the threat to our security and our way of life which is represented by the paramount objectives of the Soviet Government.

What Course Should be Followed in the Problem of Ensuring the Continuation of Our Way of Life in View of the Situation Which We Face in the Years Ahead?: If we are to maintain and improve our standards of living we cannot continue on the basis of two major wars in each generation. While the threat to our security remains, we are forced into military preparations involving a large proportion of our national income. As long as we tolerate this situation leaving the initiative in the hands of those who would bring us to our knees at the first opportunity, we play into the hands of the Kremlin.

We hear and read much about the horrors of another war. Less is said and written of the horrors of life with liberty removed, and existence organized under the oppressive system prevailing in Russia itself, or those unfortunate countries within her embrace.

Much is said on the subject of fear of Russia and fear of war. Why should we take this attitude? Surely we should express our deeper feelings, that while we all share a revulsion toward the grim business of warfare, nevertheless we recognize that indeed it may yet be necessary once more if we are unable, by any other means, to achieve satisfactory security.

Surely the spirit which led to the development of the British Commonwealth and The United States is not now to be cowed by the men of the Kremlin? We have but to examine the application of the Communistic theories to see how poor a choice they offer. And yet, unless we are to find ourselves, at some stage, forced to accept them however unwillingly, we must continue to maintain an increasingly heavy burden of military preparedness until we are prepared to face the real issue—and compel the removal of the threat.

Possession and production of atomic bombs by a power intent on extending its domination by whatever means, employing the unscrupulous methods of Communism, would create a situation utterly intolerable to the western democracies. In this connection it seems that possibly two years or more would be required by the Russians after they commence production of atomic bombs before they could produce enough to constitute an actual physical threat to our security.

If we are to retain the initiative in the choice of the pattern of our future we must decide the way in which we are to meet the threat so obviously being developed against us behind the Iron Curtain. The time factor, within which we must not only choose our course, but give effect to whatever preparatory measures may be involved is, in my opinion, the time required: by the Soviet Government:

(a) To discover how to produce atomic bombs, and
(b) Actually to produce a menacing quantity of them.

To pharaphrase a popular radio programme "Times-Awasting". Just think how quickly the past ten years have gone by, and the developments which have taken place.

I am convinced that if we are prepared for war we may not have to enter upon such a course, but if we fail to make the preparation, including the development of a realistic attitude on the part of our peoples, that we certainly shall become involved in one, but then in circumstances where the enemy will have important and perhaps decisive advantages. Can any of us here contemplate with complacency the fate which would be ours if we were defeated?

Courses Open to the Democracies: What courses lie open to us? There are some:

(A) To adopt purely defensive measures and attitudes. Such a course would require the adoption of a cave type of existence, regimentation and some form of dictatorship in anticipation of the holocaust.

(B) To await the time when both sides are in possession of atomic bombs in substantial quantities and to be prepared then for retaliation, while still retaining an attitude which leaves the initiative in the hands of the Kremlin.

(C) To take such preparatory measures as will enable us to join with other peace-loving nations, in the assembly of the United Nations in a request—backed by sufficient strength to make it demanding, that the U.S.S.R. so alters its paramount objectives as to make them no longer a menace to the security of our way of life.

Such a demanding request would constitute, in effect, an ultimatum requiring, by a fixed date, the abandonment of the present Soviet objectives and practices, and Soviet submission to safeguards for world peace and human rights as the only alternative to war.

The Course of Action Which I Recommend: I believe that this latter course is the one we should choose. It is at least doubtful if the present rulers of Russia would bow to such a request by the United Nations, or a majority of them, and therefore it is almost certain that a recouse to arms would become necessary in order to compel compliance, and thus finally to achieve a basis for lasting peace.

If our freedom through the years can only be secured by a challenge involving the possibility of war let us prepare ourselves intelligently to face the issue. The simple logic of self-preservation surely leads to the conclusion that a show-down must be precipitated before the Russians can obtain a stock-pile of atomic bombs. Such a situation would constitute a Sword of Damocles hanging over our heads with the scissors in the hands of a ruthless and implacable opponent.

By adopting the course which I am suggesting, it may well be that our strength would be so apparent to the Kremlin as to make the application of that strength unnecessary, and it is possible that, faced with the request backed by the strength and obvious determination of our peoples, the U.S.S.R. might turn from its present path, and join in a genuine way, with the remainder of the world in the pursuit of peaceful co-operation for the benefit of mankind.

However, if we are to be in a position to precipitate a show-down and end this threat to our security we must do so in circumstances where our strength relative to that of the U.S.S.R. is at its maximum level. To create these circumstances requires that a number of preparatory measures must have been carried out. These would include:

I. The continuance and acceleration of the measures of co-operation between the United States and Canada announced in February, 1947.

II. The continuation and extension of the arrangements amongst the European countries outside of the Iron Curtain.

III. The whole-hearted support of the Atlantic Pact by all countries invited to take part.

IV. The development of an appropriate strategy which would take into account the need for offensive action when and if the U.S.S.R. declined to agree to the terms of our request which we would make known through the United Nations when we were in complete readiness to initiate an all-out war to compel compliance should this fateful step be necessary.

V. Co-operation in an active political offensive, the aims of which, in my conception, would be as follows:
   (a) To force political capitulation by the Soviet Government.
   (b) To develop a positive and virile attitude amongst our own peoples which would ensure whole-hearted support for the final act when and if required, and which would make possible the preparatory measures in anticipation of an eventual requirement for mobilization.

The Development of Public Opinion: This problem of the development of public opinion is of great importance. In order to be able to resolve so vital a matter in this way requires that many preparations must have been made in advance. Such preparations involve, first of all, the decision to carry out the required planning; secondly, in order that plans can be implemented effectively it is necessary that Parliaments vote the required funds. This, in democracies, will only occur if our legislators are aware of the insistence of public opinion, and the willingness of the public to accept the inevitable repercussions, including taxation, in order in the end, to establish security.

It may be that the re-action to these propôsals is that it would be impossible, in Democratic countries, to accomplish such a programme involving the re-orientation of our national outlook, but I do not think that this is true. I believe that it is entirely within our capabilities if we are prepared to deal with the inevitable criticisms by a simple and courageous facing of facts and the evidence of Russian intentions which, in my opinion, are unmistakeable.

The problem is one which all of us would prefer not to have to face. However, it is with us and the choice is ours: but the initiative will remain in our hands for a comparatively short time—namely until the problems of quantity production of atomic bombs have been successfully solved by the Soviet.

Conclusion: No one with experience of war, or bereaved by it would wish for its recurrence, but it is well to remember that there are greater tragedies than war. Loss of freedom is one. I believe that it is better to press for a decision while we still possess a wealth of fighting experience. As far as I am personally concerned, I shall be within the age and physical category for active operations for some years yet. It is for this reason that I feel justified in presenting these views.

The basic problem comes down to this. Do we really want our way of life to continue, and if so are we prepared for the consequences of the adoption of a positive and virile attitude toward Democracy possibly involving war in order to ensure our security? Of are we to prepare, instead, for slavery?

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, TORONTO, ONTARIO

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH APRIL, 1949

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1948 .... $1,447.07

RECEIPTS

Membership Fees		$5,381.00	
Contributions from Members to defray cost of Year Book		745.25	
Proceeds of Sale of Year Books		49.97	
Interest:			
On Investments	$ 45.00		
On Bank Balance	28.63		
		$ 73.63	
			$6,249.85

PAYMENTS

Luncheon Expenses	$5,855.60		
Less:			
Proceeds of Sale of Tickets	5,265.00		
		$ 590.60	
Honoraria:			
Secretary	$ 600.00		
Treasurer	200.00		
		$ 800.00	
Miscellaneous Expenses		167.00	
Printing, Stationery and Postage		1,167.59	
Printing 1947-1948 Year Book		2,194.25	
Recording and Publicity		188.08	
Speakers' Fees and Expenses		338.14	
Telephone and Telegraph		185.57	
			$5,631.23

Excess of Receipts over Payments 618.62

Cash on Hand and in Bank as at 30th April, 1949 ......$2,065.69

We report that we have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1949, and have obtained all the information and explanations we have required, and that, in our opinion, the above Statement shows correctly the Receipts and Payments of the Club for the year ended 30th April, 1949.

In addition to the cash balance of $2.065.69, the Club holds $1,500.00 Dominion of Canada 3% Ninth Victory Loan Bonds due 1st Setember, 1966.

As at 30th April, 1949, the Club was committed to publish the 1948-49 Year Book at an estimated cost of $2,200.00.

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

Toronto, Ontario.
16th June, 1949.

Toronto, 16th June, 1949

The President and Members of the Executive Committee,
The Empire Club of Canada,
Toronto, Ontario.

GENTLEMEN,

We have examined the books and accounts of The Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, for the year ended 30th April, 1949, and have prepared and attached hereto a Statement of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 30th April, 1949.

We report thereon as follows:—

Membership Fees:

We are satisfied that, in total, all 1948-49 fees receivable from Members on record as in good standing as at 30th April, 1949 have been accounted for.

Contributions from Members to defray cost of Year Book	*$745.25*
Proceeds of Sale of Year Books	*$ 49.97*

We have not verified these items.

Membership Roll:

Following is a summary of the Membership Roll for the year: –

	Resident	*Non-Resident*	*Honorary and Life*	*Total*
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1948	1,344	57	19	1,420
Net increase or *decrease*	*56*	*1*	1	*56*
Membership Roll as at 30th April, 1949	1,288	56	20	1,364

The Treasurer has certified that the Roll as at 30th April, 1949, contained 1,364 Members as above.

Payments:

All payments made during the year were duly authorized by the Executive Committee.

Liabilities:

Mr. G. A. Lascelles, the Chairman of the Finance Committee, has certified that no accounts were outstanding as at 30th April, 1949.

Fidelity Bond:

Mr. W. W. Comber, the Treasurer, is bonded for $500.00.

Insurance:

Office Furniture is covered by a fire insurance policy in the amount of $485.00.

Acknowledgment:

We express our appreciation of the courtesy and assistance extended to us by the Treasurer during the course of our audit.

Reported by,

H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY,
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS,
Honorary Auditors.

"THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA"

PAST HONORARY PRESIDENTS:

*1903-1912	Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1913-1926	Field Marshal H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.
*1927-1931	Rt. Hon. Viscount Willingdon, G.C.S.I., G.C.M.G.
1931-1935	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Bessborough, P.G., G.C.M.G.
*1935-1940	Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedsmuir, G.C.M.G., C.H.
1940-46	Rt. Hon. The Earl of Athlone, K.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G, D.S.O., V.D.

PAST PRESIDENTS:

*1902-05	Brig.-Gen. James Mason
*1905-06	Rev. William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.
*1906-07	J. P. Murray, Esq.
1907-08	J. F. M. Stewart, Esq., B.A.
*1908-09	D. J. Goggin, Esq., M.A., D.C.L.
1909-10	Elias Clouse Esq., M.D.
*1910-11	J. Castell Hopkins, Esq., F.R.S.
*1911-12	F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, Esq., K.C.
*1912-13	Rt. Rev. James F. Sweeney, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
*1913-14	Mr. Justice James Craig
*1914-15	Lt.-Col. R. J. Stuart
*1915-16	Albert Ham, Esq., Mus. Doc.
*1916-17	James Black Perry, Esq.
*1917-18	Norman Sommerville, Esq., M.A., K.C.
1918	F. J. Coombs, Esq.
1919	R. A. Stapells, Esq.
*1920	Arthur Hewitt, Esq.
*1921	Brig.-Gen. C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
*1922	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923	Ellis H. Wilkinson, Esq.
*1924	William Brooks, Esq.
*1925	Rev. R. N. Burns, D.D.
1926	Col. A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon. A.D.C., V.D.
*1927	Col. Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928	Robert H. Fennell, Esq., K.C.
*1929	Hugh S. Eayrs, Esq.
*1930	John D. Spence, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1931	H. G. Stapells, Esq., K.C.
1932-33	Col. The Hon. Geo. A. Drew, V.D., A.D.C.
1933-34	Major W. Jas. Baxter, M.C.
1934-35	Hon. Dana H. Porter, K.C.

* Deceased.

1935-36	J. H. Brace, Esq.
1936-37	Major G. B. Balfour, B.A., K.C.
1937-38	Major R. M. Harcourt
1938-39	J. P. Pratt, Esq., K.C.
*1939-40	F. A. Gaby, Esq., B.A.Sc., D.Sc.
*1940-41	The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, P.C. (Can), K.C.
1941-42	C. R. Sanderson, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.
1942-43	John C. M. MacBeth, Esq., B.A., K.C.
1943-44	W. Eason Humphreys, Esq.
1944-45	Charles R. Conquergood, Esq.
1945-46	Eric F. Thompson, Esq.
1946-47	Major F. L. Clouse
1947-48	Tracy E. Lloyd, Esq.
1948-49	Thos. H. Howse, Esq.

*Deceased.

THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Officers and Executive Committee

Year 1949-1950

Officers:

President: H. G. Colebrook
First Vice-President: Sydney Hermant
Second Vice-President: Warren B. Hastings
Third Vice-President: R. Ford Ralph
Secretary: Lieut.-Col. John Hyde Bennett, V.D. (Deceased), Ernest Miles
Honorary-Treasurer and Treasurer: W. W. Comber, C.A.
Honorary Auditor: H. T. Jamieson, F.C.A.

Executive Committee:

Col. F. F. Arnoldi, D.S.O.
H. C. Bourlier
Brig. Colin A. Campbell, O.B.E., D.S.O.
S. S. Fletcher
Frank T. Gerow
John W. Griffin
D. H. Gibson
Horace Harpham
George Hardy
Norman A. Keys, K.C.
James H. Joyce
G. A. Lascelles
J. Morgan
Sq. L. Norman A. Nunn
J. P. Pratt, K.C.
John Wm. Perry
Cdr. R. H. Stokes-Rees, R.N.

Immediate Past President:

Thos. H. Howse

Past Presidents:

Tracey E. Lloyd
Major F. L. Clouse
Major James Baxter, M.C.

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called The Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(c) Life Members,
(d) Honorary Members,
(e) Associate Members,
(f) Corporate or Sustaining Members.

All members must be of the full age of sixteen years, and members of classes (a), (b), (c), (d) and (f) must be British subjects.

Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Active Resident, Non-Resident and Associate Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meetitng of the Executive Committee.

(2) Subject to sub-section 4 of this article Active Resident and Associate members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and Non-Resident members $3.00, payable on or before the first day of October in each year. Payment of such fees shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

(3) Associate members shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

(4) Members whose applications for membership are received after the first day of April in any year shall pay one annual fee only in respect of the period from that time till the 30th day of September in the following calendar year.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.—(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Corporate or Sustaining Members

Art. 5A—Any company, partnership or business organization shall be eligible for election as a Corporate or Sustaining Member. Applicants shall be proposed by two Active Resident Members of the Club in good standing and the application shall contain the name and position of the Officer nominated by the Applicant as its Candidate for membership. The Applicant and its Nominee shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee. A Sustaining or Corporate Member shall pay an annual fee of $50.00 which shall include the fee of its representative member.

Officers to Be Elected

Art. 6—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-Presidents; an Honorary Treasurer, or a Treasurer, or both; an Honorary Secretary or a Secretary, or both; an Executive Committee which shall consist of the officers appointed under this Article and 17 other members, who, with the officers, shall be elected by ballot, and of the ex-officio members hereinafter mentioned. There may also be elected an Assistant Secretary and Assistant Treasurer. Three Past Presidents together with the immediate Past President shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than April 30 of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. The Officers and Executive Committee then elected shall hold office until April 30th, of the following year, and thereafter until their successors respectively have been duly elected and installed. A Nominating Committee consisting of five members of the Executive Committee and four other members (this Committee shall select its own Chairman) shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and ap-

proved at a regular or special meeting of the Club not less than four and not more than six weeks before such Annual meeting, due notice of such regular or special meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such Committee shall report to the Annual Meeting. If nominations do not exceed the number of the officers and members of the Executive Committee necessary under the Constitution, the President shall instruct the Secretary to cast one ballot in favour of those so nominated and thereupon such persons shall be declared by the President to have been duly elected.

(3) An Auditor or Honorary Auditor shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows:

(a) Budget and Finance Committee.
(b) Speakers' Committee.
(c) Membership Committee.
(d) Constitution Committee.
(e) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(f) Publicity Committee.
(g) Year Book Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the Officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly, if possible, from October to April, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. An audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year shall be published in the Year Book.

Notice of Meetings

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special, and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Nine members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year of the Club shall begin on the first day of May in each year and end on the thirtieth day of April in the year following.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two thirds majority vote of the members present.

MEMBERSHIP

as at April 30, 1949

LIFE MEMBERS

Bickell, J. P.
Bruce, Hon. Dr. Herbert
Clouse, Dr. Elias
Clouse, F. L.
Cobham, Arthur H.
Coombs, F. J.
Johnson, E. E.
MacKendrick, Col. W. G.
Maher, James P.
Murdoch, J. Y., K.C., LL.D.
Sandy, J.
Scythes, J. A.
Stapells, H. G. K.C.
Stapells, R. A.
Stewart, J. F. M.
Tindall, H. B.
Wilson, Col. J. E.

HONORARY MEMBERS

Bourlier, H. C.
Geary, Major B. Handley, V.C.
Gillespie, Lt.-Col. George H.

NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS

Ahern, E. G.
Baker, Robert P.
Beaumont, Arthur
Black, H. H.
Bradley, Bruce H.
Bradley, E.
*Cawthra-Elliott, Maj. Gen. H. M.
Cranstoun, John A.
Davidson, George MacK.
Davis, Aubrey
Duff, R. B.
Dutton, B. A.
Empringham, John R.
Finch-Noyes, G. R.
Fitzsimmons, R. H.
Gilbert, C. A.
Hale, C. Harold
Haynes, H. G.
Hitchcock, C. H.
Hooper, Col. B. O., D.S.O., M.C.
Hudson, J. P.
Hughes, Gordon R.
Hutcheson, Frank W.
Jackson, E. H.
Jackson, George B.
Jamieson, Fraser
Johnston, R. C.
Kidd, Hon. T. Ashmore
Kimpton, J. R.
Kreswick, D. A.
Leather, Harold H.
Leyden, C.
Lovell, E. A.
MacLennan, H. Alexander
MacRae, John
Martin, Victor, M.P.P.
McCulley, Joseph
McIntosh, C. H.
McLaughlin, Col. R. S.
Medland, C. R.
Moffat, John A.
Moffat, J. Mel.
Newman, J. M., M.P.P.
Over, Spencer Henry
Prince, Col. Alan C.
Pugsley, T. Aubrey
Raycroft, R. I.

Reid, J. K.
Rice, H. E.
Robinson, W. E.
Ryan, John
Slatkin, Alfred D.
Thompson, J. R.
Whitmore, Harold
Wideman, Harvey
Wood, Chester F.

RESIDENT MEMBERS

Abbs, Charles E.
Ackehurst, A. V.
Adair, Herbert E.
Adams, G. W.
Adams, J. C.
Affleck, A.
Agar, Norman E.
Ahuja, M. R.
Alberts, Edgar T.
Alexander, John B.
Alexander, Robert
Alexander, R. W.
Allanson, Harry E.
Allen, Thomas
Allnutt, Rev. F. B., D.TH.
Ander, J.
Anderson, C. Harry
Anderson, E. H.
Anderson, George
Anderson, J. Murray
Anderson, W. L.
Andrecheck, E. J.
Angus, W. Harry
Appleton, C. N.
Argo, J. A.
Armstrong, J. H.
Arnoldi, Col. F. F., D.S.O. & BAR
Askin, R. J.
Atkinson, F. L.
Auerbach, O.
Aylward, R. C.

Babbitt, G. W.
Babcock, Harold A.
Bailey, Baldwin W.
Bailey, William Gill
Bain, H. R.
Bainard, R. H.
Baker, Col. E. A.
Baker, E. G.
Baker, George A.
Balani, N. J.
Baldwin, Charles O.
Balfour, Gordon B., K.C.
Balfour, Keith C.
Ballard, B. W.
Band, Charles S.
Barber, George
Barber, John R.
Barber, William
Bark, W. A.
Barrett, Brian N.
Barrow, H. E.
Bartholomew, F. W. E.
Bartley, George E.
Bartman, G. M.
Bassett, John
Bate, William B.
Bates, Rev. F. W.
Bates, William D.
Batten, Reg. A.
Baxter, Major W. James
Bealey, Ernest R.
Beardmore, S. H.
Beatty, C. W.
Beatty, Dr. H. A., M.R.C.S.
Bedford, James H.
Bedford, Morley S.
Bedolfe, Robert D.
Beeston, George H.
Begley, George E.
Bell, Lt.-Col. Arthur A.
Bell, Dr. W. J.
Bellmore, H. J.
Belyea, A. E.
Bennett, A. B.
Bennett, E. J.
*Bennett, Lieut-Col. J. H.
Bennett, Major James W.
Bennett, Norman D.
Bennett, Lt.-Col. Peter W.
Benson, D. F.
Berkinshaw, R. C.
Best, Douglas W.

Best, Gordon H.
Best, T. Harrison
Best, T. W.
Betts, D. Clive
Bickle, E. W.
Bingham, Rev. Dr. H. H.
Bishop, Colonel A. L.
Bishop, H. H.
Blackwell, H. W.
Blackwell, Hon. Leslie E.
Blue, M. F.
Boag, Ernest C.
Boase, J. B.
Boehm, A. Fred
Bogart, Ernest C., K.C.
Bogert, C. A.
Bolger, H. N.
Bomby, W. S.
Bone, Fred A.
Bongard, Gordon R.
Bongard, R. R.
Bonnell, W. H. M.
Booth, E. H.
Bottrill, E. A.
Boustred, R. Warren
Bowers, E. J.
Bowman, Capt. Tom E.
Boxer, Reginald N.
Boylen, J. C.
Boyter, J. B.
Brandon, N. D.
Britnell, Robert G.
Brittain, Horace L.
Brockwell, Meredith R.
Brooke, Arthur T.
Brookes, Air Vice Marshal G.E.
Brooks, Murray G.
Brown, F. Irving
Brown, Gerald M.
Brown, James N. M.
Brown, Murray
Brown, Ross S.
Brown, Stuart H.
Brown, W. E.
Brown, President W. T.
Browne, R. J.
Bryce, Very Rev. Peter, D.D.
Bryce, Robert A.
Bryson, R. N.
Burgess, John H.
Burke, E. T. C.
Burnett, E. R.
Burns, H. D.
Burt, A. W.
Burton, C. L.
Burton, E. G.
Burton, G. Allan
Bush, Clayton E.
Bushnell, Wm. J.
Byrne, A. T.

Calder, B. R.
Calvin, C. C.
Cameron, A. J.
Cameron, Harry
Cameron, Rev. Ross K.
Cameron, Dr. W. R.
Campbell, Brig. Colin A.
Campbell Dr. D. M.
Campbell, E. M.
Capell, S. L.
Carl, Gordon A.
Carlisle, C. H.
Carlyle, D. B.
Carnegie, F. T.
Carnegie, N. F.
Carr, John Bulloch
Carr, Walter D.
Carradus, Capt. H. R.
Carriere S. W.
Carroll, Frank J.
Carruthers, George L.
Carscallen, H. M.
Carson, C. E.
Carson, James L.
Carter, F. H.
Cartwright, Brig. Gen. G. S.
Case, Everett J.
Cassidy, Frank C.
Cassidy, H. F.
Caulder, J. A.
Chalmers, Floyd S.
Chappell, H. L.
Charles, Leo E.
Chater, Harold T.
Chester, Lane R.
Chipman, Lt.-Col. J. H.
Chisholm, Lt.-Col. G. T.

Clark, C. T.
Clark, John G.
Clark, Dr. Stanley K.
Clark, Dr. William J.
Clarke, W. H.
*Clarkson, G. T.
Clemes, J. C.
Close, Marshall
Clouse, Geoffrey L.
Cockburn, Blake A.
Cockell, J. Horace
Cody, Hon. and Rev. H.J., C.M.G.
Coke, Major E. F.
Colberg, A. M.
Colby, S. A.
Cole, Joseph A.
Colebrook, H. G.
Coles, Gordon E.
Coles, Kenneth
Collington, George E.
Comber, W. W.
Conant, Hon. Gordon D., K.C.
Connolly, C. P.
Conquergood, C. R.
Conquergood, J. N.
Coon, H. J.
Cooper, J. C.
Cooper, W. P.
Cork, J. Milton
Cornish, Prof. G. A.
Corrigan, Dr. C. A.
Corrigan, Fred S.
Corson, R. R.
Cosgrave, Rev. Dr. F. H.
Cottrelle, G. R.
Coulter, J. E.
Coulter, W. C.
Coulter, W. Howard
Courtice, A. Roy
Coutts, William E.
Coverdale, Thomas
Cowan, F. W.
Cowan, P. J.
Coyle, J. P.
Coyne, Gordon
Cozzi, A. J.
Craft, George B.
Craick, W. A.
Craig, Claude C.
Craig Lt.-Col. John A. D.
Crang, J. H.
Crawford, F. J.
Crawford, N. R.
Crawford-Brown, Lyman
Creighton, Arthur H.
Crighton, A. S.
Cross, William B.
Crossin, H. W.
Crossingham, J. H.
Crothers, J. F.
Crummey, Dr. Clarence B.

Daly R. A.
Daly, Roland O.
Dargavel, R. B.
Davidson, J. B.
Davies, H. E.
Davis, Bertram N.
Davis, Bruce P.
Davis C. B.
Davis, George A.
Davis, George D.
Davis, R. Reade
Davis, W. H.
Davis, Walter W.
Davison, Martin A.
Day Robert E.
Day, W. D.
Deacoff, G. A.
DE Galatoff, A. N.
Demcoe J. W.
Dent, C. R.
Despard, W. H.
Detweiler, W. O.
de Veber, L. S.
Dewar, A. M.
DeWitt, Prof. N. W.
Dickey, A. J.
Dicks, A. W. F.
Dilworth, W. A.
Diven, Robert E.
Dix, William B.
Dixon, J. N. S.
Dodd, George W. W.
Doleman, A. J.
Dodgson, Major E. B.
Dolson, Dr. Wilbur J. M.
Donaldson, John

Doran, F. C.
Douglas, Howard R.
Draimin, Charles
Dray Lt.-Col. W. J.
Drew, Lt.-Col. The Hon. G. A.
Duckworth, Lloyd
Duffett, Norman G.
Duke, A. A.
Duncan, James S.
Duncan, S. F.
Dunham, Lt.-Col. F. H.
Dunkelman, D.
Dunlap, D. M.
Dunn, Norman M.
Dunn, William
Dunsmore, Clinton P.
Durance, John J.
Dutton, Thomas M.
Dye, Harold E.

Eager, King
Eakin, Joseph S.
Easton, J.
Eastmure, A. W.
Eaton, Col. R. Y.
Eby, H. D.
Edmonds, C. E.
Edwards, A. Geoffrey
Edwards, H. Percy
Elgie, G. C.
Elliot, B. V.
Elliott, Charles R.
Elliott, G. N.
Ellis, C. Q.
Ellis, Matthew T.
Ellsworth, A. L.
Elton, J. O.
Ely, Edward H.
England, Charles
Enman, H. L.
Entwistle, John S.
Epstein, Morris H.
Ewing, Thos. H.
Ezrin, Maurice

Faber, George
Faber, R. W.
Fairclough, R. P.
Fairs, C. G.
Fairweather, R. H.
Falconer, H. W.
Fennell, Robert H.
Fensom, Howard E.
Fenwick, Gordon
Ferguson, H. H.
Ferguson, H. M.
Ferguson, M.
Fessenden, C. V.
Field, R. W. A.
Findlay, Major D. M.
Finlay, Fred J.
Firstbrook, Hugh M.
Fisher, A. B.
Fisher, Frank
Fisher, J. W.
Fishman, Philip
Fleming, Donald M., M.P.
Fleming, Major Robert
Fletcher, S. S.
Flynn, J.
Forrester, William J.
Foster, G. R. S.
Fox, E. D.
Frame, S. J.
Frankel, Roy H.
Frankling, T. H.
Fraser, John A.
Frazer, A. W.
Freyseng, Willis P.
Friedgut, Major A. H., K.C.
Frost, Harold R.
Fry, H.
Fulford, R. T.
Fyfe, J. Allan
Fyvie, J. M.

Gairdner, J. A.
Gamble, Frank W.
Garber, Frank
Gardiner, F. G.
Gardiner, H. H.
Gardiner, Percy R.
Garfunkel, Capt. B. H.
Garnett, W. E.
Garrett, Albert H.
Gathercole, George E.
Gaunt, J. William
Geggie, Thomas P.

Genovese, Frank A.
Gerow, Frank T.
Gianelli, Brig. Norman A.
Gianelli, Chevalier V.
Gibb, W. Kenneth
Gibbens, W. M.
Gibson, D. H.
Gibson, E. H.
Gibson, William S.
Gilbride, W. P.
Gilchrist, Dr. A. J.
Gilchrist, Prof. Lachlan
Giles, T. S. H.
Gillard, Harry R.
Gillespie, Dugald L.
Gillespie, R.
Gillespie, William
Gillett, L. G.
Glennie, George H.
Gohn, Byron E.
Goldring, Dr. C. C.
Gooderham, E. D.
Gooderham, M. Ross, K.C.
Gooding, T. W.
Goodman Edwin A.
Gordon, H. G.
Gordon, William E.
Gould, J. Lyall S.
Gowdy, D. M.
Graham, D. M.
Graham, Kingsley, K.C.
Graham, J. Lindsay
Grainger, R. N.
Grand, Percy F.
Grant, J. R.
Grant, J. W.
Grant, W. G. F.
Grattan, William R. B.
Gravely, J. F.
Greatrex, S. H.
Green, Brig. Ernest H., S.A.
Green, J. D.
Grier, A. Monro, K.C.
Griffin, J. W.
Griffith, W. L.
Griffiths, F. D.
Grimbly, Maurice
Grisdale, C. L.
Grose, George W.
Grove, Anthony A.
Guest, A. E.
Guest, Wm. C.
Gully, Harold M.
Gundy, C. L.
Gundy, J. H.
Gunn, Major General John A.

Hair, Dr. C. H.
Hall, Howard A.
Hall, I. C.
Hall, William
Hallarn, W. J.
Ham, C. N.
Ham, E. F.
Hambly, Herbert
Hambourg, Boris
Hamilton, A. E.
Hamilton, C. S.
Hamlin, Dr. Fred V.
Hammell, J. E.
Hanna, William B.
Harbinson, V. D.
Harcourt, Major R. M.
Hardaker, Gordon
Harding, Paul S.
Hardy, George
Hardy, H. R.
Hardy, Norman E.
Hargraft, W. M.
Harman, H. M.
Harpham, Cecil
Harpham, Horace
Harris, Goodwin R.
Harris, Joseph H.
Harrison, James E.
Harrison, James F.
Harrison, Kenneth J.
Harrison, W. E.
Harron, Hal S.
Harton, E. Douglas
Harvey, Dr. W. J.
Harvey, Warren G.
Hastings, C. E.
Hastings, Warren B.
Hatch, Carr
Hatton, Edward
Hawke, Eugene
Hawkins, V. S. G.

Hay, Frank
Hay, Ruthven
Hayden, Hon. Salter A.
Hayes, Barry B.
Haynes, Fred G.
Hayward, A. P.
Hazell, R. T.
Heagerty, Leo J.
Heintzman, Charles T.
Hemmerick, George
Henry, Hon. G. S.
Herbinson, William
Herington, Gordon
Hermant, Percy
Hermant, Sydney
Herod, Wesley J.
Hicks-Lyne, R. T. E.
Higgins, Fred Page
Higgins, W. A.
Highley, C. N.
Highmoor, C. K.
Hilborn, Melvin
Hill, E. E.
Hill, F. W. J.
Hill, John D.
Hill, Roy C.
Hillmer, R. W.
Hillock, James
Hodgins, Albert
Hoffman, Howard B.
Hogarth, D. M.
Hogg, N. D., M.B.E.
Holliss, J. F.
Holtzman, M. E.
Honey, Dr. E. M.
Hooker, Edwin R. K.
Hookway, C. W.
Hopkins, Dr. H. E.
Hopkins, Howard
Hopkins, Oliver B.
Hopkins, Percy E.
Horne, J. V.
Hornell, Allen
Hotrum, Frederick
Houghton, E. O.
Houghton, W. R.
Houston, H. T.
Howard, Clifford H.
Howden, Rev. H. R.
Howe, H. J.
Howse, Thomas H.
Huckvale, Robert
Hudspeth, Rev. W. H., M.B.E.
Huffman, George E.
Hugill, Albert E.
Hugill, W. M.
Hulbig, F. M.
Hull, Rodney
Humphrey, Dr. John N.
Humphries, Charles K.
Humphries, Harold G.
Humphreys, W. Eason
Humphries, W. R. B.
Hunt, A. T.
Hunt, John F.
Hunt, Capt. W.
Hunter, B. B.
Hunter, Donald F.
Hunter, E. J.
Hunter, Lt.-Col. F. Fraser
Hunter, H. T.
Hunter, K. M.
Hurlbut, C. A.
Huston, J. A.
Hutchinson, J. D. H.
Hutchison, O. A.
Hyde, F. C. W.

Inglis, M. Osborne
Irving, J. D.

Jackman, H. R.
Jackson, Charles W.
Jackson, L. G.
Jacob, E. R.
Jaffray, W. G.
Jamieson, H. T.
Jamieson, John D.
Janes, Gordon
Jarvis, H. St. J.
Jarvis, Norman S.
Jenney, H. B.
Jephcott, Dr. C. M.
Jephcott, Gerald
Jerry, Carman A.
Johnston, Lt.-Col. Baptist
Johnston, E. Graham
Johnston, Eldon

Johnston, Erskine B.
Johnston, G. F.
Johnston, O. D.
Johnston, William R.
Jolliffe, Lt.-Col. W. H.
Jones, Frank
Jones, G. J. L.
Jones, Gordon
Jones, Gordon
Jones, W. D.
Jowett, T. Robert
Joyce, James H.

Kasman, Philip
Kay, Edwin
Keefler, Lt.-Col. J. K.
Keely, George M.
Keenleyside, H. B.
Keir, William
Kelley, Hon. Russell T.
Kellow, Ralph S.
Kelly, M. J.
Kelson, Harry L.
Kendall, Philip F. J.
Kennedy, David Lawson
Kennedy, George H.
Kent, James Palmer
Kerr, A. B.
Kerr, John E.
Kerr, P. Gordon J.
Kerr, W. R.
Keys, Norman A.
Kindersley, C. M.
Kinghorn, A. A.
Kinnear, T. Clark
Kinsman, J. Victor
Kirk, A. M.
Kirkpatrick, Col. A. E.
Kirkwood, A. L. C.
Kitchen, Dr. Irving D.

LaBine, Gilbert
La Ferle, Charles
Laffey, J. V.
Laing, G. Blair
*Lamb, Col. H. J.
Lamb, Rev. Canon P. M.
Lambert, George
Lang, James
Langlois, John W.
Langlois, M. G.
Lapp, Dr. John S.
Larmour, Capt. W.
Larry, Leo J.
Lascelles, G. A.
Lavine, Arthur
*Lawer, W. L.
Lawrie, Donald L.
Lawson, Frank G.
Leacock, George D.
Ledger, W. R.
Lee, Harry S.
Leibel, Dr. Bernard
Leibel, William
Leishman, Edward E.
Leitch, G. C.
Lemon, W. E.
Lennie, E. D.
Lesco, Dr. S. J.
Levenston, Lt.-Col. G. F.
Levey, L. E.
Levy, Mark
Levy, Mort. L.
Lewis, John S.
Lewis, Robert
Lindsay, G. C.
Lindsay, W. W.
Linton, Hall
Lister, M. Parker
Lithgow, J. H.
Litteljohn, A. M.
Little, F. M.
Little, William
Livingston J. A.
Lloyd, T. E.
Lofft, H. W.
Logan, S. H.
Logie, Ben
Lord, R. W.
Long, Clinton E.
Logie, Ernest R.
Lougheed, W. J.
Lount, H. M.
Lovering, His Honor Judge Egerton
Lucas, H. A. E.
Lumbers, G. C.
Lundberg, Hans

Lyons, Lt.-Col. J. E.

Macaulay, Hon. Leopold
MacBeth, John C. M., K.C.
MacBrien, W. A. H.
Macdiarmid, W. J. G.
MacDonald, Arthur A.
Macdonald, Charleton E.
MacDonald, Dr. H. S.
MacDonald, J. K.
Macdonnell, H. W.
MacDuffee, James
MacEachern, Gordon A.
MacFadyen, W. T. A.
MacInnes, Col. C. S., K.C.
MacKay, Hon. Mr. Justice J. Keiller
MacKelcan, Fred R.
Mackellar, S. R.
MacKenzie, Ian D.
Mackey, Wallace A.
Maclachlan, Wills
MacLaren, Ian
MacLean, Commander A. D. R.C.N.V.R.
MacLean, Major Hugh C.
MacLean, Lt.-Col. J. B.
MacMillan, Dr. R. J.
MacMillan, William
MacNicol, John R., M.P.
Macphee, Norman
Macpherson, Alex F.
Macrae, E. M.
MacRae, F. J.
Mactaggart, Rev. Dr. W. A.
Magi, M. I.
Male, W. Harold
Mallison, Fred
Mancantelli, Robert
Manning, H. B.
Marchment, W. R.
Markon, K.
Marsh, F. Hedley
Marsh, John A.
Marshall, E. H.
Marshall, George A.
Marshall, G. R.
Marshall, Col. K. R.
Marshall, W. Norman
Martin, Magistrate O. M.
Martin, S. O.
Massey, Denton, M.P.
Massie, R. H. L.
Matthews, Hon. Albert
Matthews, C. F.
Matthews, C. Syd.
Matthews, F. Beverley, K.C.
Matthews, James G.
Matthews, Paul W.
Matthews, Hon. R. C.
Maxwell, Frank D.
May, George E. I.
Maynard, Robert B.
McAteer, W. B.
McAvoy, Louis Peter
McBain, Alex.
McBain, Brig. Robert, S.A.
McCaffrey, E. R.
McCarthy, D'Alton
McCarthy, John
McCarthy, Leigh M.
McCarthy, Hon. Leighton
McCartney, W. S.
McClain, John W.
McClatchie, John
McClellan, W. H.
McClelland, D. McK.
McCloskey, H. C.
McCloskey, L. C.
McColl, Hugh
McCrae, W. H.
McCraw, D. F.
McCrea, Hon. Charles
McCrea, J. G.
McCrea, T. Arthur
McCrimmon, D. A.
McCullagh, C. G.
McCully, J. E.
McDougall, R. G. M.
McDowell, George
McFadden, Harold W.
McFall, Dr. W. A.
McGaw, A. F.
McGillivray, Dr. Donald
McGillivray, T. A.
McGinnis, S. L.
McGowan, James R
McGowan, L. J.

McHardy, R. A.
McIntosh, A. N.
McKay, Will G.
McKay-Clements, J. L.
McKee, John W.
McKellar, A. R.
McKenzie, C.
McKerrow, J. O.
McKinnon, W. L.
McLaren, J. B.
McLean, Donald E.
McLean, J. S.
McLean, Roy F.
McLeod, W. N.
McMahon, S.
McMillen, John B.
McMurray, Leonard L.
McNamara, George A.
McNeil, W. G.
McNeill, E. W.
McNeillie, George G.
McPherson, R. S.
McSporran, Malcolm
McTavish, C. E.
McVey, Roy A.
McWilliams, D. B.
Medhurst, C. E. H.
Medland, J. A.
Medland, T. J.
Meech, R. G., K.C.
Mellish, A. E.
Menzies, Harold
Menzies, Thomas E.
Meredith, Arthur
Merrick, D. A. Y.
Mess, Brigadier James
Mickelsen, C.
Might, P. G.
Miles, Arthur W.
Miller, Andrew
Miller, Charles T.
Miller, P. C.
Miller, T. D.
Milliken, Walter T.
Milling, Ernest R.
Mills, J. D.
Mitchell, A. N.
Mitchell, A. R.
Mitchell, B. L.
Mitchell, Charles
Mitchell, Dr. E. W.
Mitchell, William G.
Mitchell, Lt.-Col. W. G.
Moffat, D. R.
Moffat, John H.
Moffat, Norman D.
Moncur, W. L.
Monks, R. C.
Montgomery, Dr. Robert C.
Moore, F.
Moore ,G. F.
Moore, H. Napier
Moore, R. C.
More, W. G.
Morgan, J.
Morgan, Marcel T.
Morgan, William S.
Morley, Frank
Morley, Gerald W.
Morley, Lloyd O.
Morley, R. B.
Morris, Alex. C.
Morris, G. F.
Morrison, Lt.-Col. L. S.
Morrow, F. K.
Morrow, G. A.
Mortimer, J. A.
Moss, Glenholme F.
Mudie, Hubert C. P.
Mugford, Sidney H.
Muir, William G.
Muirhead, W. T.
Mulock, Col. The Hon. W. P.
Mulqueen, F. J.
Munn, Charles H.
Munnoch, Gordon R.
Murphy, A. P.
Murphy, Thomas A.
Murray, Major Gladstone
Murray, H. W.
Mutch, C. M.
Myers, Rev. A. J. W.
Mylrea, A. J.

Nash, Gerald
Needham, C. F.
Neelands, E. V.
Neilly, Balmer

Neilson, Charles
New, Ryland H.
Newbegin, L. R.
Newell, John O.
Newman, Brigadier H.
Newman, Harry A.
Newman, T. C.
Newport, W. R.
Newth, Reg. W.
Nichol, George H.
Nicholson, H. A.
Nicholson, James
Nicol, John P.
Nightingale, George F.
Noble C. Stanley
Noble, Wilfred G.
Nock, Harry
Nodwell, Clifford F.
Noltie, I. N. R.
Norman, Harold F.
Northey, R. K.
Northway, A. G.
Nunn, Herbert G.
Nunn, Norman A.

Oakley, Thomas
Oborne, J. Ross
O'Brian, R. B.
O'Brien, G. E.
O'Connor, W. M.
Oglesby, W. V.
O'Kell, J. R.
Oldfield, Harold G.
Oldham, Harry
Olivella, Robert H.
Olver, Lt.-Col. E. A., D.S.O., V.D.
Omand, J. N
Omejer, Capt. Odegard
Ongley, David J.
Opie, R. P.
Orliffe, Herbert
Orr, W. A.
Osborne, D. Hillis
Osborne, Col. J. Ewart
Osbourn, A. J.
Osler, Glyn
Ostrom, W. R.
Owen, G. H.
Owens, C. L.

Page, William A.
Pakes, S. A.
Palm, William H.
Palmer, H. A.
Parish, M. C.
Park, Hugh
Parker, Dr. Charles B.
Parker, Very Rev. Stuart C., D.D.
Parkinson, N. F.
Parks, Capt. Arthur H.
Parsons, Robert C.
Parsons, Robert S., Jr.
Partridge, A. G.
Paterson, A. S.
Paterson, E., C.A.
Paterson, James G.
Patrick, W. G.
Patten, Edward
Patterson, R. E.
Patterson, W. E.
Pattison, Dr. C. L.
Peacock, Col. G. W., C.B.E.
Peak, Paul S.
Pearce, C. T.
Pearce, N. C.
Pearce, R. John
Pearcey, Samuel E.
Pearson, Gerald F.
Pearson, P. C.
Peckover, George
Pennington, Roy O.
Pepall, George T.
Perrin, Major J. G.
Perry, Gordon F.
Perry, H. M.
Perry, John William
Perry, N. R.
Perry, W. H.
Pettit, Godfrey S.
Pettit, Holland Jr.
Philp, H. D.
Phimister, Z. S.
Pickup, J. D.
Pickup, J. W., K.C.
Pike, Harry A.
Pike, Theodore
Plantner, J. F.
Playfair, S. B.

Playter, W. P.
Plumptre, A. F. W.
Pooler, E. H.
Porter, Hon. D. H.
Porter, Dr. George D.
Poucher, F. B.
Poupore, Lt.-Col. A. G.
Powell, R. H.
Powley, J.
Pratt, J. P. K.C.
Prentice, Magistrate John L.
Prentice, Victor F.
Price, Vincent, K.C.
Price, Lieut.-Col. W. H.
Priestman, R. B.
Proverbs, C. I.
Pullan, Harry
Pullen, Frank
Purcell, Gillis

Quinn, Gordon W.

Rae, Robert
Ralph, R. Ford
Ramsay, Victor R.
Rankin, Donald O., B.A.
Ransom, A. C.
Rawsthorn, Albert P.
Rea, Charles E.
Reburn, E. G.
Reddrop, F. O.
Reed, Col. Le Grand
Rees, S. L.
Reeve, Fred J.
Reid, Fraser D.
Reid, Harry E.
Reid, Loftus H.
Reid, Morgan
Reid, Dr. Spence
Reilly, Leonard M.
Rennie, G. H.
Rennie, Thomas
Reynolds, S. B.
Riddell, Frank A.
Riley, E. D.
Riley, Very Rev. Dean
Ripley, Bruce T.
Ritchie, John
Ritchie, Robert T.
Robarts, John A.
Robbins, W. D.
Roberts, Major A. Kelso
Roberts, C. Percy
Roberts, F. E.
Robertson, Major C. A.
Robertson, C. S.
Robertson, Douglas S.
Robertson, Duncan
Robertson, John F.
Robertson, R. A.
Robertson, W. G.
Robinette, George W.
Robinette, T. L.
Robinson, G. G.
Robinson, W. G. W.
Robinson, W. J.
Robinson, W. W.
Robson, F. E.
Roewade, O.
Rogers, Alfred
Rogers, H. A.
Rogers, H. L.
Rogerson, J. G.
Rollason, W. E.
Rolph, F. Grenville
Rooney, J. H.
Rose, G. H.
Ross, Alexander P.
Ross, Douglas G.
Rotenberg, Harry I.
Routley, Dr. F. W.
Rowe, Arthur L.
Rowland, W. Alex.
Roxborough, E. L.
Ruddy, E. L.
Rupert, H. S.
Russell-Murray, J.
Rutherford, W. S.

Sachs, W. R.
St. Lawrence, F.
Salter, W. R.
Sampson, S. F. D.
Samuel, Sigmund, LL.D.
Sanders, C. J.
Sanders, Wilfrid
Sanderson, C. R.
Sandwell, B. K.

Sargeant, E. S.
Sarjeant, Dr. P. A.
Saunders, Robert H.
Saunders, Sydney B.
Sawers, Ven. Archdeacon, F. J.
Scherer, Joseph
Scheuer, Edmund Jr.
Scheuer, Isadore S.
Schurman, C. D.
Scott, Fred
Scott, John R.
Scott, S. C.
Scott, W. S.
Scruton, J. F.
Scythes, R. L.
Seagram, J. W.
Seale, Leslie H.
Seccombe, W. Wallace
Sedgwick, Harry
Sedgwick, Joseph
Seeley, Rev. R. S. K., D.D.
Selby, W. T. H.
Sellers, W. F. C.
Semmons, Frank F.
Sewell, Ralph E.
Shakespeare, W. C.
Sharp, Major J. McA.
Sharpe, Charles T.
Shaver, Edward B. H.
Shea, Orville G.
Sheather, L. J.
Shenstone, Dr. Norman
Sheppard, G. H.
Sherbut, James
Sherk, Frank T.
Shevlen, W. A.
Shiach, Harold A.
Shiels, M. S.
Shier, Dr. R. V. B.
Sibbald, S. J.
Sifton, Major Clifford
Simpson, James I.
Simpson, William R.
Sims, R. L.
Sinclair, Gordon
Singer, J. G.
Skey, W/c. L. W. M.P.
Slater, Leslie George
Sloan, W. G.
Small, R. Hardy
Smallpeice, V. N.
Smith, A. Bayard
Smith, A. L.
Smith, Ewen G.
Smith, Gordon
Smith, H. M.
Smith, Harry R.
Smith, Irving D.
Smith, J. A.
Smith, S. E. V.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, Dr. Sidney
Smith, S. Titchener
Smith, W. C.
Snider, C. H. J.
Snively, Major A. C.
Snowdon, C. Allen
Sommerville, Wm. E.
Southall, H. L.
Sparling, E. M.
Spence, Dr. R. J.
Spence, Dr. W. A.
Spooner, C. H.
Spooner, Lt.-Col. R. T.
Springer, D. M.
Springett, Rev. E. J.
Sproule, M. L.
Stalker, N. O.
Stanley, J. N.
Stanley, Richard T.
Stapells, Arthur A.
Staples, W. W.
Steiner, E. A.
Stephens, H. A.
Stephenson, H. R.
Sterling, Stanley C.
Stewart, Alan E.
Stewart, D. E.
Stewart, Dunlop
Stewart, Wm. J., O.B.E.
Stickney, M. R.
Stodart, A. B.
Stoddart, George W.
Stoddart, W. H.
Stokes-Rees, Cdr. R. H.
Stoneman, Harry P.
Storey, Gilbert C.
Stovel, Wilfrid C.

Strathdee, Gordon
Strong, Gerald
Stuart, J. Cecil
Sturtridge, W. C.
Summers, G. F.
Switzer, Brig. T. D.
Symons, H. L.

Taylor, Charles W.
Taylor, D. R.
Taylor, E. P.
Taylor, Sq/L. H. O.
Taylor, J. R. K.
Taylor, Reginald W.
Tedman, Harry M.
Therrien, James A.
Thomas, H. O.
Thomas, R. H.
Thompson, Arthur C.
Thompson, Major A. O.
Thompson, E. F.
Thompson, Fred G.
Thompson, George W.
Thompson, Gordon V.
Thompson, G. Stanley
Thompson, Harry T.
Thompson, J. W.
Thompson, Murray O.
Thomson, James H.
Tidy, Major Frank O.
Tilston, Charles E.
Timms, Arthur P.
Tinning, Stanley E.
Tolchard, F. D.
Tory, John A.
Tosevic, Dimitri J.
Townley, N. A.
Traviss, James A.
Tredway, William G.
Trow, Dr. E. J.
Tudhope, H. R.
Tupper, Charles
Turner, Cdr. A. Charles
Turner, E. H.
Turner, James
Turville, Frank D.
Tuteur, Capt. M. P.

Udell, F. E.
Urquhart, Norman C.

Vandervoort, Arthur E.
Van Koughnet, Arthur
*Van Lane, J. F.
Van Nest, F. J.
Van Nostrand, C. I.
Vanstone, B. S.
Varty, W. George
Vaughan, J. J.
Vaughan, J. W.
Virgin, W. H.
Virtue, Roy A.
Von Maur, Jacob D.

Waddington, F. G.
Wagner, William A.
Wainwright, A. L.
Waldie, R. S.
Waldron, Keith S.
Waldruff, E. H.
Walker, Aitken
Walker, E. B.
Walker, H. C.
Walker, William
Walmsley, Joseph
Walsh, Fred T.
Walters, Chester
Walters, Fred Y.
Walton, George E.
Ward, Rev. Canon J. E.
Wardle, T. A.
Wardropper, J.
Warmoll, C. R.
Warren, Dr. C. A.
Warren, Ernest A.
Warren, Harold D.
Warwick, George R.
Warwick, R. D.
Waters, W. Keith
Waterston, Brig. E. J. (S.A.)
Watkins, William B.
Watson, W. G.
Watson, Colonel W. H.
Watt, Gordon C.
Weale, W. H.
Weeks, A. L.
Weiner, Henry
Welch, Frank

Welch, Frank E.
Welch, H. J.
Wells, E. F.
Wemp, Major Bert S.
Wessels, R. S.
West, Reg. C.
Westaway, J. W.
Weston, J. F.
Westren, John
Whidden, Dr. Howard P.
White, R. B.
White, Sir Thomas
Whiteley, J.
Whittaker, Harry
Wilbur, G. P.
Wilkes, Lt.-Col. F. Hilton
Wilkins, Cyril H.
Wilkinson, E. H.
Wilkinson, Rev. Canon F. H. M.A., B.D.
Williams, A. W.
Williams, Frank D.
Williams, Dr. J. J.
Williams, Dr. J. P. F.
Williams, R. T.
Willinsky, Dr. A. I.
Willmot, Fred G.
Willoughby, J. A.
Willoughby, V. W.

Wilson, Alex.
Wilson, A. E.
Wilson, Alex. L.
Wilson, C. Lesslie
Wilson, G. D.
Wilson, Hugh
Winchell, L. F.
Winter, L. A.
Wolfson, Norman
Wood, L. M.
Wood, R. J.
Woodcock, Rev. Canon H.F.D.
Woodland, J. C.
Wright, D. G. H.
Wright G. K.
Wright, L. V.
Wright, Capt. Palmer
Wright, Peter
Wright, W. A.
Wrong, Dr. Norman
Wyatt H. L.
Wynston, Arthur L.

Young, Cyril T.
Young Col. E. J.
Young, H. G.
Young, John A.
Young, Reginald L.
Young, T. S.
Young, W. T.

* Deceased.